arXiv:1407.8517v4 [math.CO] 25 Mar 2015

Local spectral expansion approach to high dimensional expanders

Izhar Oppenheim

March 26, 2015

Abstract. This paper introduces the notion of local spectral expansion of a simplicial complex as a possible analogue of spectral expansion defined for graphs. We show the condition of local spectral expansion has several nice implications. For example, for a simplicial complex with local spectral expansion we show vanishing of cohomology with real coefficients, Cheeger type inequalities and mixing type results and geometric overlap results.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). Primary 05E45, Secondary 05A20, 05C81.
Keywords. High dimensional expanders, graph Laplacian.

1 Introduction

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite graph without loops or multiple edges. For a vertex $u \in V$, denote by $m(u)$ the valency of u, i.e.,

$$m(u) = |\{(u, v) \in E\}|.$$

The Cheeger constant of the graph defined as follows: for $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V$, denote

$$m(U) = \sum_{u \in U} m(u).$$

The Cheeger constant of G, $h(G)$, is

$$h(G) = \min_{m(U) \leq \frac{1}{2} m(V)} \frac{|\{(u, v) \in E : u \in U, v \in V \setminus U\}|}{m(U)}.$$

Note that if G is connected, then $h(G) > 0$ and that for any graph G, $h(G) \leq 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, a graph G is called a ε-expander if $h(G) \geq \varepsilon$. The intuition behind this definition is that the larger the ε, the more connected the graph. Next, we'll recall the notion of an family of expanders. A family of graphs, $\{G_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is called a family of expanders if there is a $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}, h(G_j) \geq \varepsilon.$$

For applications, one is usually interested in a family of expanders with constant valency (i.e., $\exists k, \forall j, \forall u \in V_j, m(u) = k$) or at least uniformly bounded valency

(i.e., $\exists k, \forall j, \forall u \in V_j, m(u) \leq k$).

An equivalent definition of a family of expanders is relies on the graph Laplacian. Recall that the (normalized) Laplacian on G is a positive operator $\mathcal{L}$ on $L^2(V, \mathbb{R})$ defined by the matrix

$$\mathcal{L}(u,v) = \begin{cases} 1 & u = v \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{m(u)m(v)}} & (u,v) \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If G is connected then $\mathcal{L}$ has the eigenvalue 0 with multiplicity 1 (the eigenvector is the constant function) and all other the eigenvalues are positive. Denote by $\lambda(G)$ the smallest positive eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}$ of G. $\lambda(G)$ is often referred to as the spectral gap of G. spectral gap of G and its Cheeger constant are connected through the inequalities:

$$\frac{h(G)^2}{2} \leq \lambda(G) \leq 2h(G).$$

(for proof, see for instance [Chu96][Lemma 2], [Chu96][Theorem 1]). Thus an equivalent definition of a family of expanders is as follows: a family of graphs $\{G_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a family of expanders if all the graphs G_j are connected and there is $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda(G_j) \geq \lambda.$$

For some applications one is interested not just $\lambda(G)$ but also in the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}$, denoted here as $\kappa(G)$. For $\lambda > 0, \kappa < 2$, we shall call G a two-sided (λ, κ) expander if

$$\lambda(G) \geq \lambda, \kappa(G) \leq \kappa.$$

A (λ, κ) expander has "nice" properties (such as mixing) when λ, κ are both close to 1.

In recent years, expanders had vast applications in pure and applied mathematics (see [Lub12]). This fruitfulness of the theory of expander graph, raises the question - what should be the high dimensional analogue of expanders?, i.e., what is the analogous definition of an expander complex when one considers a n-dimensional simplicial complex, X, instead of a graph. In [Lub13] two main approaches are suggested:
The first is through the $\mathbb{F}_2$-coboundary expansion of X originated in [LM06], [MW09] and [Gro10]. The second is through studying the spectral gap of the $(n-1)$-Laplacian of X (where n is the dimension of X) or the spectral gaps of all $0, .., (n-1)$-Laplacians of X (see [PRT12], [Par13]). One of the difficulties with both approached are that both the $\mathbb{F}_2$-coboundary expansion and the spectral gap of the $n-1$-Laplacian are usually hard to calculate or even bound in examples.

This paper suggests a new approach that we call "local spectral expansion" (or 1-dimensional spectral expansion). Recall that for a simplicial complex X of dimension n and a simplex $\{u_0,...,u_k\} \in X^{(k)}$, the link of $\{u_0,...,u_k\}$ denoted $X_{\{u_0,...,u_k\}}$ is a simplicial complex of dimension $\leq n-k-1$ defined as:

$$X^{(j)}_{\{u_0,...,u_k\}} = \{\{v_0,...,v_j\} \in X^{(j)} : \{u_0,...,u_k,v_0,...,v_j\} \in X^{(k+j+1)}\}.$$

Note that if X is pure n dimensional (i.e., every simplex of X is a face of a simplex of dimension n), then $X_{\{u_0,...,u_k\}}$ is of dimension exactly $n-k-1$. Next, we can turn to define local spectral expansion:

Definition 1.1. *For $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$, a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex will be said to have λ-local spectral expansion if:*

- *X and all its links (in all dimensions > 0) are connected.*
- *Every 1-dimensional link of X has a spectral gap $\geq \lambda$, i.e.,*

$$\forall \{u_0,...,u_{n-2}\} \in X^{(n-2)}, \lambda(X_{\{u_0,...,u_{n-2}\}}) \geq \lambda.$$

For $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}, \kappa < 2$, a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex will be said to have two sided (λ,κ)-local spectral expansion if:

- *X and all its links (in all dimensions > 0) are connected.*
- *The non zero spectrum of every 1-dimensional link is contained in the interval $[\lambda,\kappa]$, i.e.,*

$$\forall \{u_0,...,u_{n-2}\} \in X^{(n-2)}, \lambda(X_{\{u_0,...,u_{n-2}\}}) \geq \lambda, \kappa(X_{\{u_0,...,u_{n-2}\}}) \leq \kappa.$$

We remark that for $n = 1$, both of the above definitions coincide with the usual definitions for graphs, using the convention $X^{(-1)} = \{\emptyset\}$ and therefore $X_\emptyset = X$.

A main advantage of the above definition is that the spectrum of the 1-dimensional links is usually easy to bound or even calculate explicitly in examples. In this paper we shall show that the local spectral expansion has interesting implications, specifically, we shall show that local spectral expansion implies

1. Vanishing of cohomology with real coefficients.
2. Spectral gaps of various Laplacians.
3. Cheeger-type inequalities.
4. Mixing type results and geometric overlap in the case of partite complexes (see definitions below).

We shall also show that two-sided local spectral expansion implies mixing-type results and geometric overlap. All these implications require extra terminology and therefore we shall overview them in the next section.

Remark 1.2. *Theorem 2.1 below actually shows that the above assumption of local spectral expansion is actually more restrictive than the assumption of spectral gaps in all the Laplacians assumed in [Par13], given the one normalizes the Laplacians appropriately (see below). Indeed, all of our results stand if one replaces the assumptions on the spectra of all* 1*-dimensional links to suitable assumptions on the spectra of all the Laplacians (this should be done carefully in some cases, such as in the partite simplcial complex case). However, we still find the assumption suggested above appealing because of its compact nature. One may think of the notion of local spectral expansion suggeted above as a Zuk-type criterion for high dimensional expansion.*

Structure of this paper. Section 2 is devoted to an overview of the main results of this paper. Section 3 lays out the framework and notations. Section 4 discusses links of simplcial complexes and the concepts of localization and restriction. Section 5 gives results about spectral gaps of Laplacians. Section 6 contains definitions about graphs which can be derived for a simplicial complex and random walks on these graph. Section 7 is devoted to stating and proving Cheeger-type inequalities for simplicial complexes with local spectral expansion. Section 8 is devoted to stating and proving mixing-type results for simplicial complexes with two-sided local spectral expansion and partite complexes with local spectral expansion. Section 9 provides a proof of geometric overlapping property based on local spectral expansion. Section 10 includes some examples of (families of) complexes with local spectral expansion. The appendix is devoted to a slight generalization of a result by Pach needed in the proof of geometric overlap.

2 Overview of main results

Throughout this section, let X be a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex such that all the links of X (including X itself, excluding 0-dimensional links) are connected. To state our results we need to introduce the following function, which we call the homogeneous weight function:

$$m : \bigcup_{k=0}^{n} X^{(k)} \to \mathbb{R}^+,$$

$$\forall 0 \leq k \leq n, \forall \tau \in X^{(k)}, m(\tau) = (n-k)! \, |\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : \tau \subseteq \sigma\}|.$$

Up to a normalization by a factor, m is just the function counting for every simplex τ how many n-dimensional simplexes contain τ as a face. Note that since X is pure n-dimensional, we get that $m(\tau) > 0$ for every τ. Also note that when X is 1-dimensional, then m is just the function assigning 1 to each edge and the valency to each vertex.
We remark that the function m is used to define the inner product of k-forms and therefore our k-Laplacians of X, $\Delta_k^+, \Delta_k^-, \Delta_k$ differ from those defined in some other papers such as [PRT12].
We shall also need the following notation to state some of our results: for $0 \leq k \leq n$ given disjoint, non empty sets $U_0, ..., U_k \subset X^{(0)}$, denote

$$m(U_0, ..., U_k) = \sum_{\{u_0,...,u_k\} \in X^{(k)}, u_0 \in U_0, ..., u_k \in U_k} m(\{u_0, ..., u_k\}).$$

Next, we are ready to review our main results:

2.1 Cohomology vanishing and Laplacians spectral gaps

Theorem 2.1. *Let X a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with λ-local spectral expansion (recall $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$). Then for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$:*

1. *The reduced k-cohomology with real coefficients vanish, i.e.,$\widetilde{H}^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = 0$.*
2. *The space of real k-forms (see definitions in section 3) admits a decomposition*
$$C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = ker(\Delta_k^+) \oplus ker(\Delta_k^-).$$
3. *There is a constant $a_k = a_k(\lambda)$ such that the non trivial spectrum of Δ_k^+ is in $[a_k, \infty)$, i.e.,*
$$Spec(\Delta_k^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [a_k, \infty),$$
and such that $\lim_{\lambda \to 1} a_k(\lambda) = 1$.
4. *If in addition there is $\kappa < 2$ such that X has a two-sided (λ, κ)-local spectral expansion, then there is a constant $b_k = b_k(\kappa)$, such that*
$$Spec(\Delta_k^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [a_k, b_k],$$
and such that $\lim_{\lambda \to 1} b_k(\lambda) = 1$.

Remark 2.2. *A version of this theorem can be traced back to the work of Garland in [Gar73]. The theorem in [Gar73] is less quantitative and does not give estimates on the spectral gaps (it also refers only to Tits-building and not for general simplicial complexes). The interested reader can find a discussion in the introduction section of [Opp12] comparing the result stated above to the result in [Gar73] and similar results ([BŚ97], [Żuk96], [DJ02], [Kas11],...). The version stated here was already proven by the author in [Opp12] in a more general setting, but for completeness, we'll repeat the proof below.*

2.2 Cheeger-type inequalities

To state the Cheeger-type results, we first redefine the 1-dimensional case. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ define

$$h^0(G) = \max\left\{\varepsilon \geq 0 : \forall \emptyset \neq U \subseteq V, \varepsilon \frac{m(U)}{m(V)} + \frac{|\{(u,v) \in E : u \in U, v \in V \setminus U\}|}{m(U)} \geq \varepsilon\right\}.$$

It is not hard to show that for every G we have $h^0(G) \leq 2h(G)$ (see proposition 7.4) and that $\lambda(G) \leq h^0(G)$ (see proposition 7.5), therefore

$$\frac{(h^0(G))^2}{8} \leq \frac{h(G)^2}{2} \leq \lambda(G) \leq h^0(G).$$

This give justification to use $h^0(G)$ as the "corrected" Cheeger constant, instead of $h(G)$. Reviewing the definition of $h^0(G)$ we can see two different measures of regarding a set $U \subset V$:

1. The expression $\frac{m(U)}{m(V)}$ which very informally can be described as a measure on "how much the set U is connected within itself with respect to the whole graph".
2. The expression $\frac{|\{(u,v)\in E: u\in U, v\in V\setminus U\}|}{m(U)}$ which very informally can be described as a measure on "how much the set U is connected to the outside of it".

Using the above reasoning, for $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and non empty disjoint sets $U_0, ..., U_k \subset X^{(0)}$ we shall define

$$h^k_{out}(U_0, ..., U_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & X^{(0)} \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^k U_i = \emptyset \\ \dfrac{m(U_0, ..., U_k, X^{(0)} \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^k U_i)}{m(U_0, ..., U_k)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

as the k-dimensional analogue of $\frac{|\{(u,v)\in E: u\in U, v\in V\setminus U\}|}{m(U)}$. Note that for every $U_0, ..., U_k \subset X^{(0)}$, $h^k_{out}(U_0, ..., U_k) \in [0,1]$. We shall also define a k-dimensional analogue of $\frac{m(U)}{m(V)}$ denoted as $h^k_{inner}(U_0, ..., U_k) \in [0,1]$.
Alas, the definition of $h^k_{inner}(U_0, ..., U_k)$ is not straightforward: define the (hyper) graph X_{k-1} as a graph with the vertex set $X^{(k-1)}$ and two vertices are connected by an edge if their corresponding $(k-1)$-dimensional simplices are contained in a single k-simplex. The sets $U_0, ..., U_k$ defines a subgraph of X_{k-1} denoted $X_k(U_0, ..., U_k)$. $X_k(U_0, ..., U_k)$ is defined in the following way - a vertex is in $X_k(U_0, ..., U_k)$ if it matches a $(k-1)$-simplex $\{u_0, ..., u_{k-1}\}$ such there is some $0 \leq i \leq k$ such that

$$u_0 \in U_0, ..., u_{i-1} \in U_{i-1}, u_i \in U_{i+1}, ..., u_{k-1} \in U_k.$$

An edge is in $X_k(U_0, ..., U_k)$ if it matches a k simplex $\{u_0, ..., u_k\}$ such that $u_0 \in U_0, ..., u_k \in U_k$. Now define the following random walk: pick a vertex in $X_k(U_0, ..., U_k)$ is random with respect to its weight (under the homogeneous weight function) and preform a random walk of X_{k-1} with respect to the homogeneous weight function (more detailed description can be found in definitions 6.13, 6.4 below). $h^{inner}(U_0, ..., U_k)$ is the conditional probability that the 2-step random walk described above stays in $X_k(U_0, ..., U_k)$ given that the 1-step random walk described above stayed in $X_k(U_0, ..., U_k)$.
Under these definitions we define for an n dimensional simplicial complex

$$h^k(X) = \max\{\varepsilon \geq 0 : \forall \emptyset \neq U_0, ..., \emptyset \neq U_k \subseteq X^{(0)} \text{ pairwise disjoint}$$
$$\left(\frac{k}{k+1} + \varepsilon\right) h^k_{inner}(U_0, ..., U_k) + \frac{1}{k+1} h^k_{out}(U_0, ..., U_k) \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

After this set up, we are finally ready to state our Cheeger-type inequality:

Theorem 2.3. *Let X a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with λ-local spectral expansion. Then for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ there is a $\varepsilon_k = \varepsilon_k(\lambda)$ such that $h^k(X) \geq \varepsilon_k$ and such that $\lim_{\lambda \to 1} \varepsilon_k(\lambda) = \frac{1}{k+1}$.*

Remark 2.4. *Cheeger-type inequalities for simplicial complexes where already considered with respect to the $(n-1)$-dimensional Laplacian - see for instance [PRT12] and [GS14]. However, our treatment passing to $h^k(X)$ defined above is, as far as we know, new.*

2.3 Mixing and geometric overlap

The expander mixing lemma is usually stated as:

Lemma 2.5 (Expander mixing lemma)**.** *Let $G=(V,E)$ be a d-regular graph of N vertices. For disjoint, non empty sets $U_0,U_1\subset V$ denote $E(U_0,U_1)$ to be the number of edges between U_0 and U_1. Then for every disjoint, non empty sets $U_0,U_1\subset V$ one has*

$$\left|E(U_0,U_1)-\frac{d|U_0||U_1|}{n}\right|\leq d\max\{1-\lambda,\kappa-1\}\sqrt{|U_0||U_1|}.$$

Note that since G is assumed to be d-regular, $|U_0|=\frac{m(U_0)}{d}$, $|U_1|=\frac{m(U_1)}{d}$. Our version of the above lemma reads as follows:

Theorem 2.6. *Let X a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with two sided (λ,κ)-local spectral expansion. Then for every $1\leq l\leq n$, there are continuous functions $\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda,\kappa)$ and $\mathcal{A}_l(\lambda,\kappa)$ (that can be worked out explicitly as a function of λ,κ,l) such that*

$$\lim_{(\lambda,\kappa)\to(1,1)}\mathcal{A}_l(\lambda,\kappa)=1,\ \lim_{(\lambda,\kappa)\to(1,1)}\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda,\kappa)=0,$$

and such that for any non empty, disjoint sets $U_0,...,U_l\subset X^{(0)}$ the following holds:

$$\left|m(U_0,...,U_l)-\mathcal{A}_l(\lambda,\kappa)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\right|\leq\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda,\kappa)\min_{0\leq i<j\leq l}\sqrt{m(U_i)m(U_j)}.$$

and

$$\left|m(U_0,...,U_l)-\mathcal{A}_l(\lambda,\kappa)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\right|\leq\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda,\kappa)\left(m(U_0)...m(U_l)\right)^{\frac{1}{l+1}}.$$

Remark 2.7. *The above result is very much inspired by the work in [Par13], in which the author assumes spectral gaps for all $0,...,(n-1)$-Laplacians and deduces a mixing analogue of the mixing lemma for an n-dimensional simplicial complex. Our treatment is very similar to the one taken in [Par13], since as stated in theorem 2.1 above, our assumption on the links implies spcetral gaps in all $0,...,(n-1)$-Laplacians when those are normalizes according to the weight function m. However, one should note that there are major differences in the end results emanating from the fact that our Laplacian are normalized with respect to m (for instance, we get tighter bounds on the difference in the absolute value).*

From the above mixing result one can deduce the property of geometric overlap (see definition 9.2) below:

Theorem 2.8. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex. There is a continuous function $\varepsilon(\lambda,\kappa):[0,1]\times[1,2]\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $\varepsilon(1,1)>0$ and such that for a simplicial complex with a "good enough" two sided (λ,κ)-local spectral expansion ("good enough" means that λ and κ are close enough to 1), then $\varepsilon(\lambda,\kappa)>0$ and X has $\varepsilon(\lambda,\kappa)$-geometric overlap.*

Remark 2.9. *The method on passing from a mixing type result to geometric overlap is taken from [Par13] and [FGL$^+$12] (we claim no originality here). The main idea is to use a theorem of Pach in [Pac98]. We had do slightly adapt the result in [Pac98] to our weighted setting and this was done in the appendix.*

2.4 Mixing and geometric overlap for partite simplicial complexes

Recall that a graph (V, E) is called bipartite if the vertex set V can be partitioned into two sides S_0, S_1 such that $E \subseteq \{\{u, v\} : u \in S_0, v \in S_1\}$. The spectrum of a bipatite graph is symmetric around 1 and the version of the mixing lemma for bipartite graphs uses this property and can be deduced only from the spectral expansion (and not the two-sided spectral expansion). Generalizing to higher dimension, we shall say that a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex X is $(n+1)$-partite, if $X^{(0)}$ can be partitioned into $n+1$ sets $S_0, ..., S_n$ such that

$$X^{(n)} \subseteq \{\{u_0, ..., u_n\} : u_0 \in S_0, ..., u_n \in S_n\}.$$

Our version of mixing for $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complexes reads as follows:

Theorem 2.10. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Denote by $S_0, ..., S_n$ the sides of X. If X has λ-local spectral expansion then for every $1 \leq l \leq n$, there is a continuous function $\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda)$ such that*

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 1} \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda) = 0,$$

and such that every non empty disjoint sets $U_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., U_l \subseteq S_l$ the following inequalities holds:

$$\left| \frac{m(U_0, ..., U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})} - \frac{1}{(n+1)n(n-1)...(n-l+1)} \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda) \min_{0 \leq i < j \leq l} \sqrt{\frac{m(U_i)m(U_j)}{m(S_i)m(S_j)}},$$

and

$$\left| \frac{m(U_0, ..., U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})} - \frac{1}{(n+1)n(n-1)...(n-l+1)} \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda) \left(\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)}) \right)^{\frac{1}{l+1}}.$$

Remark 2.11. *Mixing results for partite Ramanujan complexes were already proven in [FGL$^+$12] and [EGL14]. The treatment in those papers was very different and relied on quantitative estimate for Kazhdan property (T) of $PGL_n(F)$. Our treatment relays only on spectral gap estimates and therefore applies to any partite simplicial complex.*

From the above mixing result one can deduce the property of geometric overlap (see remark 2.9 above):

Theorem 2.12. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex. There is a continuous function $\varepsilon(\lambda) : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varepsilon(1) > 0$ and such that for a simplicial complex with a "good enough" λ-local spectral expansion ("good enough" means that λ is close enough to 1), we have that $\varepsilon(\lambda) > 0$ and that X has $\varepsilon(\lambda)$-geometric overlap.*

This theorem can be used to prove that partite quotients of affine buildings of type $\widetilde{A}_n$ have geometric overlap property, given that the thickness of the building is large enough (a different proof of this fact was already given in in [FGL$^+$12]). It can also be used to prove that partite quotients of affine buildings of any type have geometric overlap property given that the building thickness is large enough (this was conjectured in [Lub13], but as far as we know, we are the first to provide a proof).

3 framework

The framework suggested here owes its existence to the framework suggested in [BŚ97]. Throughout this paper, X is pure n-dimensional finite simplicial complex, i.e., every simplex in X is contained in at least one n-dimensional simplex.

3.1 Weighted simplicial complexes

Our results in the previous section were stated for a specific function m. However, the function m define above is only one example of a weight function on X. Since our results extend to any weight function, we shall work with the general definition of a weighted simplicial complex defined below and we shall refer to the specific function m we used in the previous section the homogeneous weight function.
For $-1 \leq k \leq n$, denote:

- $X^{(k)}$ is the set of all k-simplices in X.
- $\Sigma(k)$ the set of ordered k-simplices, i.e., $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)$ is an ordered $(k+1)$-tuple of vertices that form a k-simplex in X.

Note the $\Sigma(-1) = X^{(-1)}$ is just the singleton $\{\emptyset\}$.

Definition 3.1. *A simplicial complex X is called weighted if there is a strictly positive function $m : \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n} X^{(k)} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ (called the weight function) such that for every $-1 \leq k \leq n-1$, we have the following equality*

$$\sum_{\sigma\in X^{(k+1)},\tau\subset\sigma} m(\sigma) = m(\tau),$$

where $\tau \subset \sigma$ means that τ is a face of σ.

Given a weight function m we can define it on ordered simplices (denoting it again as m) as

$$m((v_0,...,v_k)) = m(\{v_0,...,v_k\}), \forall (v_0,...,v_k) \in \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n} \Sigma(k).$$

By the definition of m, we have the following equality:

$$\forall \tau \in \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n-1} \Sigma(k), \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k+1),\tau\subset\sigma} m(\sigma) = (k+2)!\, m(\tau),$$

where $\tau \subset \sigma$ means that all the vertices of τ are contained in σ (with no regard to the ordering). We note that under this equality one can start with a strictly positive function $m : \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n} \Sigma(k) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and get a weight function $m : \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n} X^{(k)} \to \mathbb{R}^+$:

Proposition 3.2. *Let $m : \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n} \Sigma(k) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a strictly positive function such that:*

1. *For every $1 \leq k \leq n$, and every permutation $\pi \in Sym(\{0, .., k\})$ we have*

$$m((v_0, ..., v_k)) = m((v_{\pi(0)}, ..., v_{\pi(k)})), \forall (v_0, ..., v_k) \in \Sigma(k).$$

2. $$\forall \tau \in \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n-1} \Sigma(k), \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k+1),\tau\subset\sigma} m(\sigma) = (k+2)!\, m(\tau).$$

Then $m : \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n} X^{(k)} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ defined as

$$m(\{v_0, ..., v_k\}) = m((v_0, ..., v_k)), \forall \{v_0, ..., v_k\} \in \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n} X^{(k)},$$

is a weight function.

Proof. Trivial. □

Remark 3.3. *From the definition of the weight function m, it should be clear that every map $m : X^{(n)} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ can be extended in a unique way to a weight function $m : \bigcup_{-1\leq k\leq n} X^{(k)} \to \mathbb{R}^+$.*

Definition 3.4. *m is called the homogeneous weight on X if for every $\sigma \in X^{(n)}$, we have $m(\sigma) = 1$.*

Proposition 3.5. *For every $-1 \leq k \leq n$ and every $\tau \in X^{(k)}$ we have that*

$$\frac{1}{(n-k)!} m(\tau) = \sum_{\sigma\in X^{(n)},\tau\subseteq\sigma} m(\sigma),$$

where $\tau \subseteq \sigma$ means that τ is a face of σ.

Proof. The proof is by induction. For $k = n$ this is obvious. Assume the equality is true for $k + 1$, then for $\tau \in X^{(k)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} m(\tau) &= \sum_{\sigma\in X^{(k+1)},\tau\subset\sigma} m(\sigma) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma\in X^{(k+1)},\tau\subset\sigma} (n-k-1)! \sum_{\eta\in X^{(n)},\sigma\subset\eta} m(\eta) \\ &= (n-k)(n-k-1)! \sum_{\eta\in X^{(n)},\tau\subset\eta} m(\eta) \\ &= (n-k)! \sum_{\eta\in X^{(n)},\tau\subset\eta} m(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.6. *For every $-1 \leq k < l \leq n$ and every $\tau \in X^{(k)}$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{(l-k)!} m(\tau) = \sum_{\sigma \in X^{(l)}, \tau \subset \sigma} m(\sigma).$$

Proof. For every $\sigma \in X^{(l)}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{(n-l)!} m(\sigma) = \sum_{\eta \in X^{(n)}, \sigma \subseteq \eta} m(\eta).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\sigma \in X^{(l)}, \tau \subset \sigma} m(\sigma) &= \sum_{\sigma \in X^{(l)}, \tau \subset \sigma} (n-l)! \sum_{\eta \in X^{(n)}, \sigma \subseteq \eta} m(\eta) \\
&= \frac{(n-k)!}{(l-k)!\,(n-k-(l-k))!} (n-l)! \sum_{\eta \in X^{(n)}, \tau \subseteq \eta} m(\eta) \\
&= \frac{(n-k)!}{(l-k)!} \sum_{\eta \in X^{(n)}, \tau \subseteq \eta} m(\eta) \\
&= \frac{1}{(l-k)!} m(\tau).
\end{aligned}$$

□

From now on, we shall always assume that X is weighted.

3.2 Cohomology with real coefficients

For $-1 \leq k \leq n$, denote

$$C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = \{\phi : \Sigma(k) \to \mathbb{R} : \phi \text{ is antisymmetric}\}.$$

We recall that $\phi : \Sigma(k) \to \mathbb{R}$ is called antisymmetric, if for every $(v_0, ..., v_k) \in \Sigma(k)$ and every permutation $\pi \in Sym(\{0, ..., k\})$, we have

$$\phi((v_{\pi(0)}, ..., v_{\pi(k)})) = sgn(\pi)\phi((v_0, ..., v_k)).$$

Every $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ is called a *k-form*, and $C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ is called the *space of k-forms*.
For $-1 \leq k \leq n$ define an inner product on $C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ as:

$$\forall \phi, \psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R}), \langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\tau)}{(k+1)!} \phi(\tau)\psi(\tau).$$

Note that with this inner product $C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ is a (finite dimensional) Hilbert space. Denote the norm induced by this inner product as $\|.\|$. For $-1 \leq k \leq n-1$ define the differential $d_k : C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ in the usual way, i.e., for every $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ and every $(v_0, ..., v_{k+1})$,

$$(d_k\phi)((v_0, ..., v_{k+1})) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} (-1)^i \phi((v_0, ..., \widehat{v_i}, ..., v_{k+1})).$$

One can easily check that for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ we have that $d_{k+1}d_k = 0$ and therefore we can define the cohomology in the usual way:

$$H^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = \frac{ker(d_k)}{im(d_{k-1})}.$$

Next, we describe the discrete Hodge theory in our setting. Define $\delta_k : C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ as the adjoint operator of d_k (with respect to the inner product we defined earlier on $C^k(X, \mathbb{R}), C^{k-1}(X, \mathbb{R})$). Define further operators $\Delta_k^+, \Delta_k^-, \Delta_k : C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ as

$$\Delta_k^+ = \delta_k d_k, \Delta_k^- = d_{k-1}\delta_{k-1}, \Delta_k = \Delta_k^+ + \Delta_k^-.$$

The operators $\Delta_k^+, \Delta_k^-, \Delta_k$ are called the upper Laplacian, the lower Laplacian and the full Laplacian. The reader should note that by definition, all these operators are positive (i.e., self-adjoint with a non negative spectrum).

Proposition 3.7. *For every $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ we have that*

$$H^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = ker(\Delta_k),$$

and

$$Spec(\Delta_{k-1}^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [a, b] \Leftrightarrow Spec(\Delta_k^-) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [a, b],$$

where $Spec(\Delta_{k-1}^+), Spec(\Delta_k^-)$ are the spectrum of $\Delta_{k-1}^+, \Delta_k^-$.

Proof. Notice that since $d_k^* = \delta_k$ we have the following:

$$im(\Delta_k^+) = (ker(\Delta_k^+))^\perp = (ker(d_k))^\perp = im(\delta_k),$$

$$im(\Delta_k^-) = (ker(\Delta_k^-))^\perp = (ker(\delta_{k-1}))^\perp = im(d_{k-1}).$$

Therefore, we have an orthogonal decomposition

$$ker(d_k) = ker(\Delta_k^+) = \big(ker(\Delta_k^+) \cap ker(\Delta_k^-)\big) \oplus im(\Delta_k^-) = ker(\Delta_k) \oplus im(d_{k-1}).$$

Which yields that $H^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = ker(\Delta_k)$. $ker(\Delta_k)$ is called the space of harmonic k-forms on X. Also notice that due to the fact that $\Delta_{k-1}^+ = \delta_{k-1}d_{k-1}, \Delta_k^- = d_{k-1}\delta_{k-1}$, we have

$$Spec(\Delta_{k-1}^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [a, b] \Leftrightarrow Spec(\Delta_k^-) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [a, b],$$

□

The next proposition gives an explicit formula for $\delta_k, \Delta_k^+, \Delta_k^-$:

Proposition 3.8. *1. Let $-1 \leq k \leq n-1$ then: $\delta_k : C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ is*

$$\delta_k \phi(\tau) = \sum_{\substack{v \in \Sigma(0) \\ v\tau \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \frac{m(v\tau)}{m(\tau)} \phi(v\tau), \ \tau \in \Sigma(k)$$

where $v\tau = (v, v_0, ..., v_k)$ for $\tau = (v_0, ..., v_k)$.

2. *For* $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ *and* $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)$,

$$\Delta_k^+ \phi(\sigma) = \phi(\sigma) - \sum_{\substack{v \in \Sigma(0) \\ v\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} (-1)^i \frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)} \phi(v\sigma_i).$$

3. *For* $0 \leq k \leq n$, $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ *and* $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)$,

$$\Delta_k^- \phi(\sigma) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^i \sum_{v \in \Sigma(0), v\sigma_i \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(v\sigma_i)}{m(\sigma_i)} \phi(v\sigma_i).$$

Proof. 1. For $\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)$ and $\tau \subset \sigma, \tau \in \Sigma(k)$ denote by $[\sigma : \tau]$ the incidence coefficient of τ with respect to σ, i.e., if σ_i has the same vertices as τ then for every $\psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ we have $[\sigma : \tau]\psi(\tau) = (-1)^i \psi(\sigma_i)$. Take $\phi \in C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $\psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle d\psi, \phi \rangle &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+2)!} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k+1} (-1)^i \psi(\sigma_i) \right) \phi(\sigma) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+1)!\,(k+2)!} \left(\sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k), \tau \subset \sigma} [\sigma : \tau] \psi(\tau) \right) \phi(\sigma) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(\tau)}{(k+1)!} \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k), \tau \subset \sigma} \psi(\tau) \left(\frac{[\sigma : \tau] m(\sigma)}{m(\tau)(k+2)!} \phi(\sigma) \right) \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\tau)}{(k+1)!} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1), \tau \subset \sigma} \psi(\tau) \left(\frac{[\sigma : \tau] m(\sigma)}{m(\tau)(k+2)!} \phi(\sigma) \right) \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\tau)}{(k+1)!} \psi(\tau) \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1), \tau \subset \sigma} \frac{[\sigma : \tau] m(\sigma)}{m(\tau)(k+2)!} \phi(\sigma) \right) \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\tau)}{(k+1)!} \psi(\tau) \left(\sum_{v \in \Sigma(0), v\tau \in \Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(v\tau)}{m(\tau)} \phi(v\tau) \right) \\
&= \left\langle \psi, \sum_{v \in \Sigma(0), v\tau \in \Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(v\tau)}{m(\tau)} \phi(v\tau) \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

2. For every $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ and every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta d\phi(\sigma) &= \sum_{\substack{v \in \Sigma(0) \\ v\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)} d\phi(v\sigma) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{v \in \Sigma(0) \\ v\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)} \phi(\sigma) \\
&\quad - \sum_{\substack{v \in \Sigma(0) \\ v\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} (-1)^i \frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)} \phi(v\sigma_i) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in \Sigma(k+1) \\ \sigma \subset \gamma}} \frac{m(\gamma)}{(k+2)!\, m(\sigma)} \phi(\sigma) \\
&\quad - \sum_{\substack{v \in \Sigma(0) \\ v\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} (-1)^i \frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)} \phi(v\sigma_i) \\
&= \phi(\sigma) - \sum_{\substack{v \in \Sigma(0) \\ v\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} (-1)^i \frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)} \phi(v\sigma_i).
\end{aligned}$$

3. For every $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ and every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)$ we have:

$$d\delta\phi(\sigma) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^i \delta\phi(\sigma_i) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^i \sum_{v \in \Sigma(0), v\sigma_i \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(v\sigma_i)}{m(\sigma_i)} \phi(v\sigma_i).$$

□

Note that by the above proposition, we have for every $\phi \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R})$ that

$$\delta_{-1}\phi(\emptyset) = \sum_{v \in \Sigma(0)} \frac{m(v)}{m(\emptyset)} \phi(v),$$

and

$$\forall u \in \Sigma(0), \Delta_0^- \phi(u) = \delta_0 \phi(\emptyset).$$

Proposition 3.9. *For every* $\phi \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R})$, $\left\langle \Delta_0^- \phi, \phi \right\rangle = \|\delta_{-1}\phi\|^2 = \|\Delta_0^- \phi\|^2$.

Proof. For every $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \Delta_0^- \phi, \phi \right\rangle &= \sum_{u\in\Sigma(0)} m(u) \left(\sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)} \frac{m(v)}{m(\emptyset)}\phi(v) \right) \phi(u) \\ &= \left(\sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)} \frac{m(v)}{m(\emptyset)}\phi(v) \right) \sum_{u\in\Sigma(0)} m(u)\phi(u) \\ &= m(\emptyset) \left(\sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)} \frac{m(v)}{m(\emptyset)}\phi(v) \right)^2 \\ &= \|\delta_{-1}\phi\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Also note that

$$\|\delta_{-1}\phi\|^2 = m(\emptyset) \left(\sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)} \frac{m(v)}{m(\emptyset)}\phi(v) \right)^2 = \sum_{u\in\Sigma(0)} m(u) \left(\sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)} \frac{m(v)}{m(\emptyset)}\phi(v) \right)^2 = \|\Delta_0^- \phi\|^2.$$

□

Proposition 3.10. *For every $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$, $\Delta_0^-\phi$ is the projection of ϕ on the space of constant 0-forms.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{1} \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$ be the constant function $\mathbf{1}(u) = 0, \forall u \in \Sigma(0)$. Then the projection of ϕ on the space of constant 0-forms is given by $\frac{\langle \phi, \mathbf{1}\rangle}{\|\mathbf{1}\|^2}\mathbf{1}$. Note that

$$\|\mathbf{1}\|^2 = \sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)} m(v) = m(\emptyset),$$

$$\langle \phi, \mathbf{1}\rangle = \sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)} m(v)\phi(v).$$

Therefore for every $u \in \Sigma(0)$,

$$\frac{\langle \phi, \mathbf{1}\rangle}{\|\mathbf{1}\|^2}\mathbf{1}(u) = \sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)} \frac{m(v)}{m(\emptyset)}\phi(v) = \Delta_0^-(u).$$

□

Define the reduced cohomology $\widetilde{H}^k(X,\mathbb{R})$ as $\widetilde{H}^k(X,\mathbb{R}) = H^k(X,\mathbb{R})$ for $k > 0$ and $\widetilde{H}^k(X,\mathbb{R}) = ker(\Delta_0^-) \cap ker(\Delta_0^+)$.

Remark 3.11. *Note that since m is positive on every simplex, we get that if X is connected, then $ker(\Delta_0^+)$ is the space of constant functions and $\widetilde{H}^k(X,\mathbb{R}) = 0$. Also note that in the case that X is a graph (i.e., a 1-dimensional simplicial complex) and m is homogeneous, then Δ_0^+ is just the usual graph Laplacian.*

Remark 3.12. *We remark that for Δ_0^+ one always have $\|\Delta_0^+\| \leq 2$, where $\|.\|$ here denotes the operator norm (we leave this calculation to the reader). We also remark that the largest eigenvalue of Δ_0^+ is always larger than 1. This can be seen easily when thinking about Δ_0^+ in matrix form: it is a matrix with 1 along the diagonal and 0 as an eigenvalue. Since the trace of Δ_0^+ as a matrix is equal to the sum of eigenvalues, we can deduce it must have at least one eigenvalue strictly larger than 1.*

From now on, when there is no chance of confusion, we will omit the index of $d_k, \delta_k, \Delta_k^+, \Delta_k^-, \Delta_k$ and just refer to them as $d, \delta, \Delta^+, \Delta^-, \Delta$.

3.3 partite simplicial complexes

In important source of examples of simplicial complexes which act like bipartite expander graphs comes from $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complexes:

Definition 3.13. *An n-dimensional simplicial complex X will be called $(n+1)$-partite, if there is a disjoint partition $X^{(0)} = S_0 \cup ... \cup S_n$ such that for every $u, v \in X^{(0)}$,*

$$\{u, v\} \in X^{(1)} \Rightarrow \exists 0 \leq i, j \leq n, i \neq j, u \in S_i, v \in S_j.$$

If X is pure n-dimensional, the above condition is equivalent to the following condition:

$$\{u_0, ..., u_n\} \in X^{(n)} \Rightarrow \exists \pi \in Sym(\{0, ..., n\}), \forall 0 \leq i \leq n, u_i \in S_{\pi(i)}.$$

We shall call $S_0, ..., S_n$ the sides of X.

Let X be a pure n-dimensional, weighted, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex with sides $S_0, ..., S_n$ as in the above definition. We shall define the following operators:
For $0 \leq j \leq n$ and $-1 \leq k \leq n-1$, define

$$d_{(k,j)} : C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{R}),$$

as following:

$$d_{(k,j)}\phi((v_0, ..., v_{k+1})) = \begin{cases} 0 & v_0 \notin S_j, ..., v_{k+1} \notin S_j \\ (-1)^i \phi((v_0, ..., \widehat{v_i}, ..., v_{k+1})) & v_i \in S_j \end{cases}.$$

Denote by $\delta_{(k,j)} : C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ the adjoint operator to $d_{(k,j)}$ and $\Delta^-_{(k,j)} = d_{(k-1,j)}\delta_{(k-1,j)}$.

Proposition 3.14. *Let $-1 \leq k \leq n, 0 \leq j \leq n$, then for every $\phi \in C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{R})$*

$$\delta_{(k,j)}\phi(\tau) = \sum_{v \in S_j, v\tau \in \Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(v\tau)}{m(\tau)}\phi(v\tau).$$

Proof. Let $\phi \in C^{k+1}(X, \mathbb{R}), \psi \in C^k$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle d_{(k,j)}\psi, \phi \right\rangle &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+2)!} d_{(k,j)}\psi(\sigma)\phi(\sigma) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma=(v_0,...,v_{k+1}) \in \Sigma(k+1), v_i \in S_j} \frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+2)!}(-1)^i \psi(\sigma_i)\phi(\sigma) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma=(v_0,...,v_{k+1}) \in \Sigma(k+1), v_i \in S_j} \frac{m(v_i\sigma_i)}{(k+2)!}\psi(\sigma_i)\phi(v_i\sigma_i) \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} \sum_{v \in S_j} \frac{m(v\tau)}{(k+1)!}\psi(\tau)\phi(v\tau) \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\tau)}{(k+1)!}\psi(\tau) \left(\sum_{v \in S_j} \frac{m(v\tau)}{m(\tau)}\phi(v\tau) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

A straightforward computation gives raise to:

Corollary 3.15. *For every $0 \leq k \leq n$, $0 \leq j \leq n$ and every $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ we have that*

$$\Delta^-_{(k,j)}\phi(\sigma) = \begin{cases} 0 & \sigma = (v_0, ..., v_k), \forall i, v_i \notin S_j \\ (-1)^i \sum_{v \in S_j, v\sigma_i \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(v\sigma_i)}{m(\sigma_i)} \phi(v\sigma_i) & \sigma = (v_0, ..., v_k), v_i \in S_j \end{cases}.$$

4 Links of X

Let $\{v_0, ..., v_j\} = \tau \in X^{(j)}$, denote by X_τ the *link* of τ in X, that is, the (pure) complex of dimension $n - j - 1$ consisting on simplices $\sigma = \{w_0, ..., w_k\}$ such that $\{v_0, ..., v_j\}, \{w_0, ..., w_k\}$ are disjoint as sets and $\{v_0, ..., v_j\} \cup \{w_0, ..., w_k\} \in X^{(j+k+1)}$. Note that for $\emptyset \in \Sigma(-1)$, $X_\emptyset = X$.
For an ordered simplex $(v_0, ..., v_j) \in \Sigma(k)$ define $X_{(v_0,...,v_j)} = X_{\{v_0,...,v_j\}}$.
Throughout this article we shall assume that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected .
Next, we'll basically repeat the definitions that we gave above for X:
For $0 \leq k \leq n - j - 1$, denote by $\Sigma_\tau(k)$ the set of ordered k-simplices in X_τ.
Define the function $m_\tau : \bigcup_{0 \leq k \leq n-j-1} \Sigma_\tau(k) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ as

$$\forall \sigma \in \Sigma_\tau(k), m_\tau(\sigma) = m(\tau\sigma),$$

where $\tau\sigma$ is the concatenation of τ and σ, i.e., if $\tau = (v_0, ..., v_j), \sigma = (w_0, ..., w_k)$ then $\tau\sigma = (v_0, ..., v_j, w_0, ..., w_k)$.

Proposition 4.1. *The function m_τ defined above follows the conditions stated in proposition 3.2, i.e., m_τ is a weight function of X_τ.*

Proof. The fact that m_τ is invariant under permutation is obvious, therefore we are left to check that for every $\eta \in \Sigma_\tau(k)$ we have

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_\tau(k+1), \eta \subset \sigma} m_\tau(\sigma) = (k+2)!\, m_\tau(\eta).$$

For $\eta \in \Sigma_\tau(k)$ we have by definition

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_\tau(k+1), \eta \subset \sigma} m_\tau(\sigma) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_\tau(k+1), \eta \subset \sigma} m(\tau\sigma) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Sigma(j+k+2), \tau\eta \subset \gamma} \frac{(k+2)!}{(j+k+3)!} m(\gamma) \\ &= \\ &= (k+2)!\, m(\tau\eta) = (k+2)!\, m_\tau(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

□

We showed that X_τ is a weighted simplicial complex with the weight function m_τ and therefore we can repeat all the definitions given before for X. Therefore we have:

1. $C^k(X_\tau, \mathbb{R})$ with the inner product on it.
2. Differential $d_{\tau,k} : C^k(X_\tau, \mathbb{R}) \to C^{k+1}(X_\tau, \mathbb{R})$, $\delta_{\tau,k} = (d_{\tau,k})^*.\delta_{\tau,0}$.
3. $\Delta^+_{\tau,k} = \delta_{\tau,k} d_{\tau,k}, \Delta^-_{\tau,k} = d_{\tau,k-1}\delta_{\tau,k-1}, \Delta_{\tau,k} = \Delta^+_{\tau,k} + \Delta^-_{\tau,k}$.

From now on, when there is no chance of confusion, we will omit the index of $d_{\tau,k}, \delta_{\tau,k}, \Delta^+_{\tau,k}, \Delta^-_{\tau,k}, \Delta_{\tau,k}$ and just refer to them as $d_\tau, \delta_\tau, \Delta^+_\tau, \Delta^-_\tau, \Delta_\tau$.

Remark 4.2. *Notice that for an n-dimensional simplicial complex X, if m is homogeneous, then for every $\tau \in \Sigma(n-2)$, X_τ is a graph such that m_τ assigns the value 1 for every edge. In this case, $\Delta^+_{\tau,0}$ is the usual graph Laplacian.*

We now turn to describe how maps $C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ induce maps on the links of X. This is done in two different ways described below: localization and restriction.

4.1 Localization

Definition 4.3. *For $\tau \in \Sigma(j)$ and $j - 1 \leq k \leq n$ define the* localization map

$$C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C^{k-j-1}(X_\tau, \mathbb{R}),\ \phi \to \phi_\tau,$$

where ϕ_τ is defined by $\phi_\tau(\sigma) = \phi(\tau\sigma)$.

When $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R}), k > 0$, one can compute $\|\phi\|^2, \|\delta\phi\|^2, \|d\phi\|^2$ by using all the localizations of the form $\phi_\tau, \tau \in \Sigma(k-1)$. This is described in the following lemmas:

Lemma 4.4. *For every $0 \leq k \leq n$ and every $\phi, \psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$, one has:*

1. $$(k+1)! \langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \langle \phi_\tau, \psi_\tau \rangle .$$
2. *For $\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)$,*
$$k! \langle \delta\phi, \delta\psi \rangle = \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \langle \delta_\tau \phi_\tau, \delta_\tau \psi_\tau \rangle .$$

Proof. 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \langle \phi_\tau, \psi_\tau \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{u \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} m_\tau(u) \phi_\tau(u) \psi_\tau(u) \\
&= \\
&\sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{u \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} m(\tau u) \phi(\tau u) \psi(\tau u) \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k), \tau \subset \sigma} \frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+1)!} \phi(\sigma) \psi(\sigma) \\
&= \\
&\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+1)!} \phi(\sigma) \psi(\sigma) \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1), \tau \subset \sigma} 1 \\
&= (k+1)! \langle \phi, \psi \rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

2. For every $\phi, \psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ and every $\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \delta_\tau \phi_\tau, \delta_\tau \psi_\tau \rangle \\
&= m_\tau(\emptyset) \left(\frac{1}{m_\tau(\emptyset)} \sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} m_\tau(v) \phi_\tau(v) \right) \left(\frac{1}{m_\tau(\emptyset)} \sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} m_\tau(v) \psi_\tau(v) \right) \\
&= m(\tau) \left(\frac{1}{m(\tau)} \sum_{v \in \Sigma(0), \tau v \in \Sigma(k)} m(\tau v) \phi(\tau v) \right) \left(\frac{1}{m(\tau)} \sum_{v \in \Sigma(0), \tau v \in \Sigma(k)} m(\tau v) \psi(\tau v) \right) \\
&= m(\tau)((-1)^k \delta\phi(\tau))((-1)^k \delta\psi(\tau)) \\
&= m(\tau)(\delta\phi(\tau))(\delta\psi(\tau)),
\end{aligned}$$

and the equality in the lemma follows.

□

Lemma 4.5. *For every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and every $\phi, \psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$, one has:*

$$k! \langle d\phi, d\psi \rangle = \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \left(\langle d_\tau \phi_\tau, d_\tau \psi_\tau \rangle - \frac{k}{k+1} \langle \phi_\tau, \psi_\tau \rangle \right).$$

Proof. For $k = 0$, there is only $\emptyset \in \Sigma(-1)$ and $\phi_\emptyset = \phi, \psi_\emptyset = \psi$, $d_\emptyset = d$ and the lemma is trivial. Assume that $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. For $(v_0, ..., v_{k+1}) = \sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)$ and $0 \leq i < j \leq k+1$ denote

$$\sigma_{ij} = (v_0, ...\hat{v_i}, ..., \hat{v_j}, ..., v_{k+1}).$$

By this notation we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
(d\phi(\sigma))(d\psi(\sigma)) = &\sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq k+1} (\phi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_i) - \phi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_j))(\psi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_i) - \psi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_j)) \\
&- k \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k+1} \phi(\sigma_i)\psi(\sigma_i) \\
= &\sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq k+1} \Bigg((\phi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_i) - \phi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_j))(\psi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_i) - \psi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_j)) \\
&\qquad - \frac{k}{k+1} (\phi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_i)\psi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_i) + \phi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_j)\psi_{\sigma_{ij}}(v_j)) \Bigg) \\
= &\frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1), \tau \subset \sigma} \Bigg((d_\tau \phi_\tau(\sigma - \tau))(d_\tau \psi_\tau(\sigma - \tau)) \\
&\qquad - \frac{k}{k+1} \sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0), v \subset \sigma - \tau} \phi_\tau(v)\psi_\tau(v) \Bigg),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma - \tau$ is the 1-dimensional simplex obtained by deleting the the vertices of τ from σ.

We can use this equality to connect $\langle d\phi, d\psi\rangle$ to $\langle d_\tau\phi_\tau, d_\tau\psi_\tau\rangle$ and $\langle \phi_\tau, \psi_\tau\rangle$:

$$k!\,\langle d\phi, d\psi\rangle = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+2)!} k!\, d\phi(\sigma) d\psi(\sigma)$$

$$= \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k+1)} \frac{1}{(k+2)!} \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1),\tau\subset\sigma} m_\tau(\sigma-\tau) \Bigg((d_\tau\phi_\tau(\sigma-\tau))(d_\tau\psi_\tau(\sigma-\tau)) - \frac{k}{k+1} \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0),v\subset\sigma-\tau} \phi_\tau(v)\psi_\tau(v) \Bigg)$$

$$= \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \frac{1}{(k+2)!} \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k+1),\tau\subset\sigma} m_\tau(\sigma-\tau) \Bigg((d_\tau\phi_\tau(\sigma-\tau))(d_\tau\psi_\tau(\sigma-\tau)) - \frac{k}{k+1} \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0),v\subset\sigma-\tau} \phi_\tau(v)\psi_\tau(v) \Bigg)$$

$$= \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \frac{1}{(k+2)!} \frac{(k+2)!}{2} \sum_{\eta\in\Sigma_\tau(1)} m_\tau(\eta) \Bigg((d_\tau\phi_\tau(\eta))(d_\tau\psi_\tau(\eta)) - \frac{k}{k+1} \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0),v\subset\eta} \phi_\tau(v)\psi_\tau(v) \Bigg)$$

$$= \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{\eta\in\Sigma_\tau(1)} \frac{m_\tau(\eta)}{2} (d_\tau\phi_\tau(\eta))(d_\tau\psi_\tau(\eta)) - \frac{k}{k+1} \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{\eta\in\Sigma_\tau(1)} \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0),v\subset\eta} \frac{m_\tau(\eta)}{2} \phi_\tau(v)\psi_\tau(v).$$

Note that

$$\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{\eta\in\Sigma_\tau(1)} \frac{m_\tau(\eta)}{2} (d_\tau\phi_\tau(\eta))(d_\tau\psi_\tau(\eta)) = \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \langle d_\tau\phi_\tau, d_\tau\psi_\tau\rangle.$$

Also note that

$$\frac{k}{k+1} \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{\eta\in\Sigma_\tau(1)} \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0),v\subset\eta} \frac{m_\tau(\eta)}{2} \phi_\tau(v)\psi_\tau(v) =$$

$$\frac{k}{k+1} \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0)} \phi_\tau(v)\psi_\tau(v) \sum_{\eta\in\Sigma_\tau(1),v\subset\eta} \frac{m_\tau(\eta)}{2} =$$

$$\frac{k}{k+1} \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0)} \phi_\tau(v)\psi_\tau(v) m_\tau(v) = \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \frac{k}{k+1} \langle \phi_\tau, \psi_\tau\rangle.$$

Therefore we get the desired equality. □

Corollary 4.6. *For every $1 \le k \le n$ and every $\phi, \psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$, one has:*

$$k!\,\langle d\phi, d\psi\rangle + k!\,k\langle \phi, \psi\rangle = \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \langle d_\tau\phi_\tau, d_\tau\psi_\tau\rangle.$$

In particular, for $\phi = \psi$, one has:

$$k!\,\|d\phi\|^2 + k!\,k\|\phi\|^2 = \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \|d_\tau\phi_\tau\|^2.$$

Proof. Combine the equality of lemma 4.4 1. with the equality of lemma 4.5. □

Next, we'll discuss localization for $(n+1)$-partite complexes. Let X be a pure n-dimensional, weighted, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex with sides $S_0, ..., S_n$. Notice that for any $-1 \leq k \leq n-1$, X_τ is a $(n-k)$-partite complex. In order to keep the indexing of the sides consistent, we shall denote as follows: for $\tau = (v_0, ..., v_k), v_i \in S_{j_i}$, the sides of X_τ will be denoted by $S_{\tau,j}$, where $j \neq j_0, ..., j_k$ and $S_{\tau,j} \subseteq S_j$.
This will allow us to define $d_{\tau,(l,j)}, \delta_{\tau,(l,j)}$ on X_τ for $-1 \leq l \leq n-k-1$ in the following way: if $\tau = (v_0, ..., v_k), v_i \in S_{j_i}$, then for $j \neq j_0, ..., j_k$, define $d_{\tau,(l,j)}, \delta_{\tau,(l,j)}$ as above (using the indexing on X_τ). If $j = j_i$ for some $0 \leq i \leq k$, then define $d_{\tau,(l,j)} \equiv 0, \delta_{\tau,(l,j)} \equiv 0$. Denote $\Delta^-_{\tau,(l,j)} = d_{\tau,(l-1,j)}\delta_{\tau,(l-1,j)}$.
After setting these conventions, we can show the following:

Proposition 4.7. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, weighted, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex. Then for every $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ and every $0 \leq j \leq n$, we have that*

$$k! \langle \Delta^-_{(k,j)}\phi, \phi \rangle = \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \langle \Delta^-_{\tau,(0,j)}\phi_\tau, \phi_\tau \rangle.$$

Proof. Let $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$, then by definition

$$\begin{aligned}
k! \langle \Delta^-_{(k,j)}\phi, \phi \rangle &= k! \langle \delta^-_{(k,j)}\phi, \delta^-_{(k,j)}\phi \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} m(\tau) \left(\sum_{v \in S_j, v\tau \in \Sigma(k+1)} \frac{m(v\tau)}{m(\tau)} \phi(v\tau) \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} m_\tau(\emptyset) \left(\sum_{v \in S_j, v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} \frac{m_\tau(v)}{m_\tau(\emptyset)} \phi_\tau(v) \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \|\delta_{\tau,(0,j)}\phi_\tau\|^2 \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} \langle \Delta^-_{\tau,(0,j)}\phi_\tau, \phi_\tau \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.2 Restriction

Definition 4.8. *For $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $\tau \in \Sigma(l)$ s.t. $k+l+1 \leq n$, the restriction of ϕ to X_τ is a function $\phi^\tau \in C^k(X_\tau, \rho_\tau)$ defined as follows:*

$$\forall \sigma \in \Sigma_\tau(k), \phi^\tau(\sigma) = \phi(\sigma).$$

For $\phi, \psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$, one can compute $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle$ using all the localizations of the form ϕ^τ, ψ^τ. This is described in the following lemma:

Lemma 4.9. *For every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ let $\phi, \psi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $0 \leq l \leq n-k-1$. Then*

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma(l)} \langle \phi^\tau, \psi^\tau \rangle.$$

Proof.

$$\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(l)}\langle\phi^\tau,\psi^\tau\rangle=\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(l)}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_\tau(k)}\frac{m_\tau(\sigma)}{(k+1)!}\phi^\tau(\sigma)\psi^\tau(\sigma)=$$
$$\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(l)}\frac{1}{(k+1)!}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_\tau(k)}m(\tau\sigma)\phi(\sigma)\psi(\sigma)=$$
$$\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(l)}\frac{1}{(k+1)!}\sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma(l+k+1),\tau\subset\gamma}\frac{(k+1)!}{(l+k+2)!}m(\gamma)\phi(\gamma-\tau)\psi(\gamma-\tau),$$

where $\gamma-\tau$ means deleting the vertices of τ from γ. Changing the order of summation gives

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma(l+k+1)}\frac{m(\gamma)}{(l+k+2)!}\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(l),\tau\subset\gamma}\phi(\gamma-\tau)\psi(\gamma-\tau)=$$
$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma(l+k+1)}\frac{m(\gamma)}{(l+k+2)!}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k),\sigma\subset\gamma}\frac{(l+1)!}{(k+1)!}\phi(\sigma)\psi(\sigma)=$$
$$\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)}\frac{(l+1)!\,\phi(\sigma)\psi(\sigma)}{(l+k+2)!\,(k+1)!}\sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma(l+k+1),\sigma\subset\gamma}m(\gamma)$$

Recall that by corollary 3.6 we have that

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma(l+k+1),\sigma\subset\gamma}m(\gamma)=\frac{(l+k+2)!}{(l+1)!}m(\sigma).$$

Therefore we get

$$\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)}\frac{(l+1)!\,\phi(\sigma)\psi(\sigma)}{(l+k+2)!\,(k+1)!}\sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma(l+k+1),\sigma\subset\gamma}m(\gamma)$$
$$=\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)}\frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+1)!}\phi(\sigma)\psi(\sigma)$$
$$=\langle\phi,\psi\rangle.$$

□

Lemma 4.10. *Assume that X is of dimension >1. Let $\phi,\psi\in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$ and $0\le l\le n-1$, then*

$$\langle d\phi,d\psi\rangle=\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(l)}\langle d_\tau\phi^\tau,d_\tau\psi^\tau\rangle,$$

where d_τ is the restriction of d to the link of τ.

Proof. Note that

$$\forall(v_0,v_1)\in\Sigma_\tau(1),d_\tau\phi^\tau((v_0,v_1))=\phi(v_0)-\phi(v_1)=d\phi((v_0,v_1))=(d\phi)^\tau((v_0,v_1)),$$

and similarly

$$\forall(v_0,v_1)\in\Sigma_\tau(1),d_\tau\psi^\tau((v_0,v_1))=(d\phi)^\tau((v_0,v_1)).$$

Therefore $d_\tau(\phi^\tau)=(d\phi)^\tau,d_\tau(\psi^\tau)=(d\psi)^\tau$ and the lemma follows from the previous one. □

4.3 Connectivity of links

Throughout this paper, we'll assume X and all its links of dimension > 0 are connected . We show that this implies that X has strong connectivity properties, namely we shall show that X is gallery connected (see definition below).

Definition 4.11. *A pure n-dimensional simplicial complex is called gallery connected, if for every two vertices $u, v \in X^{(0)}$ there is a sequence of simplexes $\sigma_0, ..., \sigma_l \in X^{(n)}$ such that $u \in \sigma_0, v \in \sigma_l$ and for every $0 \leq i \leq l-1$, we have that $\sigma_i \cap \sigma_{i+1} \in X^{(n-1)}$.*

Proposition 4.12. *Let X be a connected pure n-dimensional simplicial complex. If all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected, then X is gallery connected.*

Proof. We shall prove the by induction on n. If $n = 1$ then gallery connected is the same as connected and there is nothing to prove. Assume the proposition holds for $n-1$. Let X be a connected pure n-dimensional simplicial complex such that all the links of X are connected. Then the $(n-1)$-skeleton of X is a pure $(n-1)$-simplicial complex with connected links. Therefore, by the induction assumption, for every $u, v \in X^{(0)}$, there are $\tau_0, ..., \tau_l \in X^{(n-1)}$ such that $u \in \tau_0, v \in \tau_l$ and for every $0 \leq i \leq l-1$, $\tau_i \cap \tau_{i+1} \in X^{(n-2)}$. X is pure n-dimensional, therefore we can take $\sigma_i \in X^{(n)}$ such that for every $0 \leq i \leq l$, $\tau_i \subset \sigma_i$. If $l = 0$ there is nothing to prove. Assume $l > 0$, to finish, we shall show that for every $0 \leq i \leq l-1$ there is a gallery connecting σ_i and σ_{i+1} (and therefore one can take a concatenation of those galleries). Fix $0 \leq i \leq l-1$. Denote $\eta = \tau_i \cap \tau_{i+1} \in X^{(n-2)}, v' = \tau_i \setminus \eta, v'' = \tau_{i+1} \setminus \eta$. By our assumptions X_η is connected, therefore there are $v_1, ..., v_k \in X_\eta^{(0)}$ such that

$$\{v', v_1\}, \{v_1, v_2\}, ..., \{v_k, v''\} \in X_\eta^{(1)}.$$

Denote

$$\sigma_0' = \eta \cup \{v', v_1\}, \sigma_1' = \eta \cup \{v_1, v_2\}, ..., \sigma_k' = \eta \cup \{v_k, v''\}.$$

Note that $\sigma_0', ..., \sigma_k' \in X^{(n)}$ and that

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq k-1, \sigma_i' \cap \sigma_{i+1}' = \eta \cup \{v_i\} \in X^{(n-1)}.$$

Also note that

$$\tau_i \subseteq \sigma_i \cap \sigma_0', \tau_{i+1} \subseteq \sigma_{i+1} \cap \sigma_k'.$$

Therefore there is a gallery connecting σ_i and σ_{i+1} and we are done.

□

5 Laplacian spectral gaps

In this section we will show that a large spectral gap on the upper Laplacian on all the 1 dimensional links induces spectral gaps in all the other Laplacians (in the Laplacians of all the other links and in the Laplacians of X). The exact formulation appears in theorem 5.8. The results of this section were already worked-out by the author in a more general setting in [Opp12]. We chose to include all the proofs and not just refer to [Opp12] in order to keep this paper self-contained.

5.1 Descent in links

We shall show that spectral gaps of the 0 upper Laplacian "trickle down" through links of simplices of different dimension. Specifically, we shall show the following:

Lemma 5.1. *Let X as before, i.e., a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Also, assume that $n > 1$. For $0 \leq k \leq n-2$, if there are $\kappa \geq \lambda > 0$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\sigma,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \kappa],$$

then

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \left[2 - \frac{1}{\lambda}, 2 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right].$$

Proof. Fix some $\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)$. First note that

$$\bigcup_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau v,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\sigma,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \kappa].$$

For every $v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)$ and recall that $\Delta^-_{\tau_v}\phi^v$ is the projection of ϕ^v to the space of constant maps on $X_{\tau v}$. Denote by $(\phi^v)^1$ the orthogonal compliment of that projection.
Since $X_{\tau v}$ is connected for every $v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)$, the kernel of $\Delta^+_{\tau v}$ is the space of constant maps. Therefore for every $v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)$ we have that

$$\kappa \|(\phi^v)^1\|^2 \geq \|d_{\tau v}\phi^v\|^2 \geq \lambda \|(\phi^v)^1\|^2.$$

Take $\phi \in C^0(X_\tau, \mathbb{R})$ to be a non constant eigenfunction of Δ^+_τ with the eigenvalue $\mu > 0$ (recall that X_τ is connected so the kernel of Δ^+_τ is the space of constant functions) , i.e.,

$$\Delta^+_\tau \phi(u) = \mu \phi(u).$$

By lemma 4.10 we have

$$\mu \|\phi\|^2 = \|d_\tau \phi\|^2 = \sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} \|d_{\tau v}\phi^v\|^2.$$

Combined with the above inequalities this yields:

$$\kappa \sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} \|(\phi^v)^1\|^2 \geq \mu \|\phi\|^2 \geq \lambda \sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} \|(\phi^v)^1\|^2. \tag{1}$$

Next, we shall compute $\sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} \|(\phi^v)^1\|^2$. Note that

$$\|(\phi^v)^1\|^2 = \|(\phi^v)\|^2 - \|\Delta^-_{\tau v}\phi^v\|^2.$$

By lemma 4.9 we have that

$$\sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} \|(\phi^v)\|^2 = \|\phi\|^2,$$

and therefore we need only to compute $\sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0)}\|\Delta^-_{\tau v}\phi^v\|^2$. First, let us write $\Delta^-_{\tau v}\phi^v$ explicitly:

$$\Delta^-_{\tau v}\phi^v \equiv \frac{1}{m_{\tau v}(\emptyset)}\sum_{u\in\Sigma_{\tau v}(0)} m_{\tau v}(u)\phi^v(u) = \frac{1}{m_\tau(v)}\sum_{(v,u)\in\Sigma_\tau(1)} m_\tau((v,u))\phi(u).$$

Notice that since $\Delta^+_\tau\phi = \mu\phi$, we get

$$\mu\phi(v) = \Delta^+_\tau\phi(v) = \phi(v) - \frac{1}{m_\tau(v)}\sum_{(v,u)\in\Sigma_\tau(1)} m_\tau((v,u))\phi(u) = \phi(v) - \Delta^-_{\tau v}\phi^v.$$

Therefore

$$\Delta^-_{\tau v}\phi^v = (1-\mu)\phi(v).$$

This yields

$$\sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0)}\|\Delta^-_{\tau v}\phi^v\|^2 = \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0)} m_\tau(v)(1-\mu)^2\phi(v)^2 = (1-\mu)^2\|\phi\|^2.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0)}\|(\phi^v)^1\|^2 = \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0)}\|(\phi^v)\|^2 - \sum_{v\in\Sigma_\tau(0)}\|\Delta^-_{\tau v}\phi^v\|^2 = \|\phi\|^2(1-(1-\mu)^2) = \|\phi\|^2\mu(2-\mu).$$

Combine with the inequality in (1) to get

$$\kappa\|\phi\|^2\mu(2-\mu) \geq \mu\|\phi\|^2 \geq \lambda\|\phi\|^2\mu(2-\mu).$$

Dividing by $\|\phi\|^2\mu$ yields

$$\kappa(2-\mu) \geq 1 \geq \lambda(2-\mu).$$

And this in turns yields

$$2-\frac{1}{\kappa} \geq \mu \geq 2-\frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

Since μ was any positive eigenvalue of $\Delta^+_{\tau,0}$ we get that

$$Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\} \subseteq \left[2-\frac{1}{\lambda}, 2-\frac{1}{\kappa}\right].$$

□

Our next step is to iterate the above lemma. Consider the function $f(x) = 2-\frac{1}{x}$. One can easily verify that this function is strictly monotone increasing and well defined on $(0,\infty)$. Denote $f^2 = f\circ f$, $f^j = f\circ\ldots\circ f$. Simple calculations show the following:

$$\forall m\in\mathbb{N}, f(\frac{m}{m+1}) = \frac{m-1}{m}, f(1) = 1$$

$$\forall a>1, \{f^j(a)\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \text{ is a decreasing sequence and } \lim_{j\to\infty} f^j(a) = 1.$$

Corollary 5.2. *Let X be as in the lemma and f as above. Assume that there are $\kappa \geq \lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma(n-2)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\sigma,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \kappa],$$

then for every $-1 \leq k \leq n-3$ we have

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \left[f^{n-k-2}(\lambda), f^{n-k-2}(\kappa)\right] \subseteq \left(\frac{k+1}{k+2}, f^{n-k-2}(\kappa)\right].$$

Proof. The proof is a straightforward induction using lemma 5.1. One only needs to verify that for every $-1 \leq k \leq n-3$ we have $f^{n-k-2}(\lambda) > 0$, but this is guaranteed by the condition $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$. □

Corollary 5.3. *Let X be as above. Then for every $-1 \leq k \leq n-2$ we have*

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \subseteq \left[0, \frac{n-k}{n-k-1}\right].$$

Moreover, for every $-1 \leq k \leq n-3$, every $\tau \in X^{(k)}$ and every $\phi \in C^0(X_\tau, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\Delta^+_{\tau,0}\phi = \frac{n-k}{n-k-3}\phi \Rightarrow \forall \sigma \in X^{(n-k-1)}_\tau, \Delta^+_{\sigma,0}\phi^\sigma = 2\phi^\sigma.$$

Proof. Notice that

$$f^{n-k-2}(2) = \frac{n-k}{n-k-1}.$$

Recall that $\|\Delta^+_0\| \leq 2$ and therefore, one can always take $\kappa = 2$. By corollary 5.2 we get that for every $-1 \leq k \leq n-2$ we have

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(k)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \left[0, \frac{n-k}{n-k-1}\right].$$

Let $-1 \leq k \leq n-2$, $\tau \in X^{(k)}$ and $\phi \in C^0(X_\tau, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\Delta^+_0\phi = \mu\phi$. Assume there is a single $v \in X^{(0)}_\tau$ such that (in the notations of the proof of lemma 5.4)

$$\frac{n-k-1}{n-k-2}\|(\phi^v)^1\|^2 > \|d_{\tau v}\phi^v\|^2.$$

By the fact proven above, for any other $v \in X^{(0)}_\tau$, we have

$$\frac{n-k-1}{n-k-2}\|(\phi^v)^1\|^2 \geq \|d_{\tau v}\phi^v\|^2.$$

Therefore we can repeat the proof of lemma 5.4, with strict inequalities. Namely, instead of inequality (1), we can take

$$\frac{n-k-1}{n-k-2}\sum_{v \in \Sigma_\tau(0)} \|(\phi^v)^1\|^2 > \mu\|\phi\|^2,$$

and complete the rest of the proof with strict inequalities and get

$$2-\frac{1}{\frac{n-k-1}{n-k-2}}>\mu,$$

which yields

$$\frac{n-k}{n-k-1}>\mu.$$

Therefore

$$\Delta^+_{\tau,0}\phi=\frac{n-k}{n-k-1}\phi\Rightarrow\forall v\in X^{(0)}_\tau,\Delta^+_{\tau v,0}\phi^v=\frac{n-k-1}{n-k-2}\phi^v.$$

Finish by induction on k, starting with $k=n-3$ and descending. □

5.2 Local to global

We'll show that large enough spectral gaps of the upper Laplacian $\Delta^+_{\tau,0}$ for all $\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)$ implies spectral gaps for Δ^+_k .

Lemma 5.4. *Let X as before, i.e., a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension >0 are connected. Also, assume that $n>1$. For $0\le k\le n-1$, if there are $\kappa\ge\lambda>0$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\}\subseteq[\lambda,\kappa],$$

then for every $\phi\in C^k(X,\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$(k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\kappa-\frac{k}{k+1}\right)-\kappa\|\delta\phi\|^2\ge\|d\phi\|^2\ge(k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\lambda-\frac{k}{k+1}\right)-\lambda\|\delta\phi\|^2.$$

Proof. Let $0\le k\le n-1$. Fix some $\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)$ and some $\phi\in C^k(X,\mathbb{R})$. For ϕ_τ recall that $\Delta^-_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau$ is the projection of ϕ_τ on the space of constant functions. Denote by $(\phi_\tau)^1$ the orthogonal complement of this projection. Since X_τ is connected we have that $ker(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})$ is exactly the space of constant functions and therefore

$$\kappa\|(\phi_\tau)^1\|^2\ge\left\langle\Delta^+_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau,\phi_\tau\right\rangle\ge\lambda\|(\phi_\tau)^1\|^2.$$

Note that $\|(\phi_\tau)^1\|^2=\|\phi_\tau\|^2-\|\Delta^-_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2$ and that $\left\langle\Delta^+_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau,\phi_\tau\right\rangle=\|d_\tau\phi_\tau\|^2$. Therefore

$$\kappa\|\phi_\tau\|^2-\|\Delta^-_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2\ge\|d_\tau\phi_\tau\|^2\ge\lambda\|\phi_\tau\|^2-\|\Delta^-_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2.$$

Since the above inequality is true for every $\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)$ we can sum over all $\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)$ and get

$$\kappa\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2-\|\Delta^-_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2\right)\ge\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\|d_\tau\phi_\tau\|^2\ge\lambda\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2-\|\Delta^-_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2\right).$$

By proposition 3.9 we have that $\|\Delta^-_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2=\|\delta_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2$, therefore we can write

$$\kappa\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2-\|\delta_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2\right)\ge\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\|d_\tau\phi_\tau\|^2\ge\lambda\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2-\|\delta_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2\right).$$

By lemma 4.4, applied for $\phi = \psi$, we have that

$$\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2 - \|\delta_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau\|^2\right) = (k+1)!\,\|\phi\|^2 - k!\,\|\delta\phi\|^2.$$

Therefore

$$\kappa\left((k+1)!\,\|\phi\|^2 - k!\,\|\delta\phi\|^2\right) \geq \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \|d_\tau\phi_\tau\|^2 \geq \lambda\left((k+1)!\,\|\phi\|^2 - k!\,\|\delta\phi\|^2\right).$$

By corollary 4.6 we have for every $\phi \in C^k(X,\mathbb{R})$ that

$$k!\,\|d\phi\|^2 + k!\,k\|\phi\|^2 = \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \|d_\tau\phi_\tau\|^2,$$

and therefore

$$\kappa\left((k+1)!\,\|\phi\|^2 - k!\,\|\delta\phi\|^2\right) \geq k!\,\|d\phi\|^2 + k!\,k\|\phi\|^2 \geq \lambda\left((k+1)!\,\|\phi\|^2 - k!\,\|\delta\phi\|^2\right).$$

Dividing by $k!$ and then subtracting $k\|\phi\|^2$ gives the inequality stated in the lemma. □

Corollary 5.5. *Let X as in the above lemma. For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, if there are $\kappa \geq \lambda > \frac{k}{k+1}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda,\kappa],$$

then

$$\left\| \Delta^+_k + \frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\Delta^-_k - (k+1)\left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2} - \frac{k}{k+1}\right)I \right\| \leq (k+1)\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2},$$

where $\|.\|$ denotes the operator norm.

Proof. From lemma 5.4 we have for every $\phi \in C^k(X,\mathbb{R})$ that

$$(k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\kappa - \frac{k}{k+1}\right) - \kappa\|\delta\phi\|^2 \geq \|d\phi\|^2 \geq (k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\lambda - \frac{k}{k+1}\right) - \lambda\|\delta\phi\|^2.$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&(k+1)\langle\phi,\phi\rangle\left(\kappa - \frac{k}{k+1}\right) - \kappa\langle\Delta^-_k\phi,\phi\rangle \\
&\geq \langle\Delta^+_k\phi,\phi\rangle \\
&\geq (k+1)\langle\phi,\phi\rangle\left(\lambda - \frac{k}{k+1}\right) - \lambda\langle\Delta^-_k\phi,\phi\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\left\langle((k+1)I - \Delta^-_k)\phi,\phi\right\rangle &\geq \left\langle\left(\Delta^+_k + \frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\Delta^-_k \right.\right. \\
&\qquad \left.\left. - (k+1)\left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2} - \frac{k}{k+1}\right)I\right)\phi,\phi\right\rangle \\
&\geq -\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\left\langle((k+1)I - \Delta^-_k)\phi,\phi\right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have for every ϕ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left\langle\left(\Delta_k^+ + \frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\Delta_k^- - (k+1)\left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2} - \frac{k}{k+1}\right)I\right)\phi, \phi\right\rangle\right| \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\left\langle((k+1)I - \Delta_k^-)\phi, \phi\right\rangle \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}(k+1)\|\phi\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Delta_k^+ + \frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\Delta_k^- - (k+1)(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2} - \frac{k}{k+1})I$ is a self adjoint operator and therefore the above inequality gives the inequality stated in the theorem. □

Corollary 5.6. *Let X as in the above lemma. For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, if there are $\kappa \geq \lambda > \frac{k}{k+1}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \kappa],$$

then $\widetilde{H}^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = 0$, there is an orthogonal decomposition $C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = ker(\Delta_k^+) \oplus ker(\Delta_k^-)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
Spec(\Delta_k^+) \setminus \{0\} &\subseteq [(k+1)\lambda - k, (k+1)\kappa - k], \\
Spec(\Delta_{k+1}^-) \setminus \{0\} &\subseteq [(k+1)\lambda - k, (k+1)\kappa - k], \\
Spec(\Delta_k^-) \setminus \{0\} &\subseteq \left[(k+1) - \frac{k}{\lambda}, (k+1) - \frac{k}{\kappa}\right], \\
Spec(\Delta_{k-1}^+) \setminus \{0\} &\subseteq \left[(k+1) - \frac{k}{\lambda}, (k+1) - \frac{k}{\kappa}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since X is assumed to be connected all the statements for $k = 0$ are trivial. Assume that $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. First notice that if $\lambda > \frac{k}{k+1}$ we get by lemma 5.4 that for every $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) \setminus \{0\}$ ((0 here is the constant 0 function in $C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$).

$$\left\langle\Delta_k^+\phi, \phi\right\rangle + \lambda\left\langle\Delta_k^-\phi, \phi\right\rangle \geq (k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\lambda - \frac{k}{k+1}\right) > 0.$$

Therefore $ker(\Delta_k) = ker(\Delta_k^+) \cap ker(\Delta_k^-) = \{0\}$. Recall that proposition 3.7 $H^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = ker(\Delta_k)$ and therefore $H^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = 0$. From $H^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = 0$ we get that $ker(d_k) = im(d_{k-1})$. Recall that (see proof of proposition 3.7)

$$ker(d_k) = ker(\Delta_k^+), im(d_{k-1}) = im(\Delta_k^-),$$

and therefore $ker(\Delta_k^+) = im(\Delta_k^-)$. Since Δ_k^- is self adjoint we get that

$$(ker(\Delta_k^+))^\perp = (im(\Delta_k^-))^\perp = ker(\Delta_k^-),$$

and as a consequence, $ker(\Delta_k^-)^\perp = ker(\Delta_k^+)$. Therefore there is an orthogonal decomposition $C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = ker(\Delta_k^+) \oplus ker(\Delta_k^-)$.
Also, since Δ_k^+ is self adjoint, we get that

$$Spec(\Delta_k^+) \setminus \{0\} = Spec(\Delta_k^+|_{(ker(\Delta_k^+))^\perp}) = Spec(\Delta_k^+|_{ker(\Delta_k^-)}).$$

For every $\phi \in ker(\Delta_k^-)$ we have by lemma 5.4 that

$$(k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\kappa - \frac{k}{k+1}\right) \geq \left\langle \Delta_k^+\phi, \phi\right\rangle \geq (k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\lambda - \frac{k}{k+1}\right).$$

Therefore

$$Spec(\Delta_k^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [(k+1)\lambda - k, (k+1)\kappa - k].$$

By proposition 3.7 we get that

$$Spec(\Delta_{k+1}^-) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [(k+1)\lambda - k, (k+1)\kappa - k].$$

By the same considerations,

$$Spec(\Delta_k^-) \setminus \{0\} = Spec(\Delta_k^+|_{ker(\Delta_k^+)}).$$

For every $\phi \in ker(\Delta_k^-)$ we have by lemma 5.4 that

$$(k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\kappa - \frac{k}{k+1}\right) - \kappa\left\langle \Delta_k^-\phi, \phi\right\rangle \geq 0,$$

$$0 \geq (k+1)\|\phi\|^2\left(\lambda - \frac{k}{k+1}\right) - \lambda\left\langle \Delta_k^-\phi, \phi\right\rangle.$$

Therefore

$$Spec(\Delta_k^-) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [(k+1) - \frac{k}{\lambda}, (k+1) - \frac{k}{\kappa}].$$

By proposition 3.7 we get that

$$Spec(\Delta_{k-1}^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [(k+1) - \frac{k}{\lambda}, (k+1) - \frac{k}{\kappa}].$$

□

Corollary 5.7. *Let X as above. Then for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, we have that*

$$Spec(\Delta_k^+) \subseteq \left[0, \frac{n+1}{n-k}\right],$$

$$Spec(\Delta_{k+1}^-) \subseteq \left[0, \frac{n+1}{n-k}\right].$$

Proof. Combine the above corollary with corollary 5.3, stating that

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta_{\tau,0}^+) \subseteq \left[0, \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\right],$$

and therefore $\kappa \leq \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}$. This yields that

$$\begin{aligned}(k+1)\kappa - k &\leq (k+1)\frac{n+1-k}{n-k} - k \\ &= \frac{n+1}{n-k}.\end{aligned}$$

□

5.3 Very local to very global

Combining lemma 5.4 and corollaries 5.6, 5.2 we'll prove the exact formulation of theorem 2.1 stated above. Namely, we'll show that large spectral gap in all the 1-dimensional links yield spectral gaps in $\Delta_k^+, \Delta_{k+1}^-$ for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$.

Theorem 5.8. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Also, assume that $n > 1$. Denote $f(x) = 2 - \frac{1}{x}$ and f^j to be the composition of f with itself j times (where f^0 is defined as $f^0(x) = x$). If there are $\kappa \geq \lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(n-2)} Spec(\Delta_{\tau,0}^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \kappa].$$

Then for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$:

1. *$\widetilde{H}^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = 0$ and $C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) = ker(\Delta_k^+) \oplus ker(\Delta_k^-)$.*
2. $$Spec(\Delta_k^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [(k+1)f^{n-1-k}(\lambda) - k, (k+1)f^{n-1-k}(\kappa) - k],$$
$$Spec(\Delta_{k+1}^-) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [(k+1)f^{n-1-k}(\lambda) - k, (k+1)f^{n-1-k}(\kappa) - k].$$

Proof. First apply corollary 5.2 to get spectral gaps of $\Delta_{\tau,0}^+$ for every $\tau \in \Sigma(k)$ when $-1 \leq k \leq n-3$ in terms of f and λ, κ (notice that since $X_\emptyset = X$ this takes care of the case $k = 0$ in 3. of the theorem). Then apply corollaries 5.5 and 5.6 to finish the proof. □

Remark 5.9. *In the above proof it seems that we are only using two of the estimates given in corollary 5.6 and that we have two additional estimates of the spectrum of $\Delta_k^+, \Delta_{k+1}^-$. We leave it to the reader to check that when using the function f, the two estimates given in corollary 5.6 coincide.*

Remark 5.10. *As remarked earlier, if m is the homogeneous weight function, then for every $\tau \in \Sigma(n-2)$, $\Delta_{\tau,0}^+$ is the usual graph Laplacian on the graph X_τ. This means that if one assigns the homogeneous weight on X, then the spectral gap conditions stated in the above theorem are simply spectral gaps conditions of the usual graph Laplacian on each of the 1-dimensional links. In concrete examples, these spectral gap conditions are easily attainable (see examples below).*

5.4 partite complexes

Proposition 5.11. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Then we have for the spectrum of Δ_0^+ that:*

$$Spec(\Delta_0^+) \subseteq \left[0, \frac{n+1}{n}\right].$$

If X is also $(n+1)$-partite then the space of eigenfunctions of the eigenvalue $\frac{n+1}{n}$ is spanned by the functions φ_i, $0 \leq i \leq n$ defined as

$$\varphi_i(u) = \begin{cases} n & u \in S_i \\ -1 & otherwise \end{cases}.$$

Proof. The claim about the non trivial spectrum of Δ_0^+ is due to corollary 5.7 applied for $k = 0$. Assume that X is $(n+1)$-partite. First we verify that each φ_i defined above is indeed an eigenfunction of the eigenvalue $\frac{n+1}{n}$. We check the following cases:

1. In the case $u \in S_i$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_0^+\varphi_i(u) &= \varphi_i(u) - \sum_{v\in X^{(0)},(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)}\varphi_i(v) \\
&= n - \sum_{v\in X^{(0)},(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)}(-1) \\
&= n + \sum_{v\in X^{(0)},(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)} \\
&= n+1 \\
&= \frac{n+1}{n}\varphi_i(u).
\end{aligned}$$

2. In the case where $u \notin S_i$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_0^+\varphi_i(u) &= -1 - \sum_{v\in X^{(0)},(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)}\varphi_i(v) \\
&= -1 - \sum_{v\in X^{(0)}\setminus S_i,(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)}(-1) \\
&\quad - \sum_{v\in S_i,(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)}n.
\end{aligned}$$

   Recall that by proposition 3.5 and by the fact that X is pure n-dimensional and $(n+1)$-partite, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
m(u) &= n! \sum_{\sigma\in X^{(n)},u\subset\sigma} m(\sigma) \\
&= n! \sum_{v\in S_i,(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} \sum_{\sigma\in X^{(n)},\{u,v\}\subset\sigma} m(\sigma) \\
&= n \sum_{v\in S_i,(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} m((u,v)).
\end{aligned}$$

   Similarly,

$$(n-1)m(u) = n \sum_{v\in X^{(0)}\setminus S_i,(u,v)\in\Sigma(1)} m((u,v)).$$

   Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_0^+\varphi_i(u) &= -1 + \frac{n-1}{n} - 1 \\
&= -\frac{n+1}{n} \\
&= \frac{n+1}{n}\varphi_i(u).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we'll prove that φ_i span the space of eigenfunctions with eigenvalue $\frac{n+1}{n}$. For $n = 1$, this is the classical argument for bipartite graphs repeated here for the convenience of the reader. Let $\phi \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\Delta_0^+\phi = 2\phi$ and X is a bipartite graph. There is $u_0 \in X^{(0)}$ such that $\forall v \in X^{(0)}, |\phi(u_0)| \geq |\phi(v)|$. Without loss of generality $u_0 \in S_0$. One can always normalize ϕ such that $\phi(u_0) = 1$ and for every other $v \in X^{(0)}$, $|\phi(v)| \leq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 2 &= \Delta\phi(u_0) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{v \in X^{(0)}, (u_0,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u_0, v))}{m(u_0)} \phi(v) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{v \in X_1^{(0)}, (u_0,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u_0, v))}{m(u_0)} \phi(v) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{v \in X_1^{(0)}, (u_0,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u_0, v))}{m(u_0)} \phi(v) = -1.$$

Note that $\sum_{v \in X_1^{(0)}, (u_0,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u_0, v))}{m(u_0)} = 1$ and $\forall v, \phi(v) \geq -1$ and therefore we get that for every $v \in X_1^{(0)}$ with $(u_0, v) \in \Sigma(1)$ we get $\phi(v) = -1$. By the same considerations, for every $v \in X^{(0)}$ with $\phi(v) = -1$, we have

$$u \in X^{(0)}, (v, u) \in \Sigma(1) \Rightarrow \phi(u) = 1.$$

Therefore by iterating this argument and using the fact that the graph is connected, we get that

$$\phi(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & u \in S_0 \\ -1 & u \in X_1^{(0)} \end{cases},$$

and that is exactly φ_0 in the case $n = 1$. Assume that $n > 1$.
First, for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, note that $\chi_{S_i} = \frac{1}{n+1}(\varphi_i + \chi_{X^{(0)}})$ (Recall that $\chi_{X^{(0)}}$ denotes the constant 1 function and χ_{S_i} denotes the indicator function of S_i). Therefore every function ϕ of the form:

$$\exists c_0, ..., c_n \in \mathbb{R}, \forall u \in S_i, \phi(u) = c_i,$$

is in the space spanned by the functions φ_i and the constant functions. Therefore, for ϕ such that $\Delta_0^+\phi = \frac{n+1}{n}\phi$, it is enough to show that ϕ is of the form

$$\exists c_0, ..., c_n \in \mathbb{R}, \forall u \in S_i, \phi(u) = c_i.$$

Let $\phi \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\Delta_0^+\phi = \frac{n+1}{n}\phi$. Fix $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $u' \in S_i$. By proposition 4.12, X is gallery connected so for every $u \in S_i$ there is a gallery $\sigma_0, ..., \sigma_l \in X^{(n)}$ connecting u' and u. We'll show by induction on l that $\phi(u) = \phi(u')$. For $l = 0$, $u = u'$ and we are done. Assume the claim is true for l. Let $u \in S_i$ such that the shortest gallery connecting u' and u is $\sigma_0, ..., \sigma_{l+1} \in X^{(n)}$. By the fact that X is $(n+1)$-partite, there is $u'' \in \sigma_l \cap S_i$ therefore u'', u are both in the link of $\sigma_l \cap \sigma_{l+1} \in X^{(n-1)}$. Since $n > 1$, $\sigma_l \cap \sigma_{l+1}$ is of dimension > 1, therefore there is a non empty simplex $\tau \in X^{(n-2)}$ such that $\tau \subset \sigma_l \cap \sigma_{l+1}$. Note that by the $(n+1)$-partite assumption of X, we have

that the link of X_τ is a bipartite graph, containing u'' and u. From corollary 5.3 we have that

$$\Delta_0^+ \phi^\tau = 2\phi^\tau.$$

Therefore, from the case $n = 1$, we get that

$$\phi(u'') = \phi^\tau(u'') = \phi^\tau(u) = \phi(u).$$

By our induction assumption, $\phi(u') = \phi(u'')$ and therefore ϕ must be of the form stated above and we are done. □

Remark 5.12. *The functions φ_i defined above are not orthogonal to each other and in fact they don't even form a basis, because they a linearly dependent.*

The above proposition indicates that when dealing with an $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex, one should think of the non trivial spectrum of Δ_0^+ as $Spec(\Delta_0^+) \setminus \{0, \frac{n+1}{n}\}$. Following this logic, we denote the space of non trivial functions $C^0(X, \mathbb{R})_{nt}$ as

$$C^0(X, \mathbb{R})_{nt} = span\{\chi_{X^{(0)}}, \varphi_0, ..., \varphi_n\}^\perp.$$

Proposition 5.13. *Let χ_{S_i} be the indicator function of S_i, then*

$$C^0(X, \mathbb{R})_{nt} = span\{\chi_{S_0}, ..., \chi_{S_n}\}^\perp.$$

Moreover, for every $\phi \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R})$, the projection of ϕ on $C^0(X, \mathbb{R})_{nt}$ is

$$\phi - (n+1)\sum_{j=0}^{n} \Delta^-_{(0,j)}\phi.$$

Proof. As noted in the proof of the proposition above, $\chi_{S_i} = \frac{1}{n+1}(\varphi_i + \chi_{X^{(0)}})$. Also notice that

$$\chi_{X^{(0)}} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \chi_{S_i},$$

$$\forall i, \varphi_i = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \chi_{X_j^{(0)}} + (n-1)\chi_{S_i}.$$

Therefore

$$span\{\varphi_0, ..., \varphi_n, \chi_{X^{(0)}}\} = span\{\chi_{S_0}, ..., \chi_{S_n}\}.$$

Notice that for every j,

$$\|\chi_{S_j}\|^2 = \sum_{v \in S_j} m(v) = \frac{1}{n+1} m(\emptyset),$$

and for every $\phi \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R})$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \phi, \chi_{S_j} \rangle \chi_{S_j} &= \left(\sum_{v \in S_j} \phi(v) \right) \chi_{S_j} \\ &= m(\emptyset) \Delta^-_{(0,j)} \phi.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$, the projection of ϕ on $C^0(X,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$ is

$$\sum_{j\,=0}^{n} \frac{1}{\|\chi_{S_j}\|^2}\langle \phi, \chi_{S_j}\rangle \chi_{S_j} = \frac{n+1}{m(\emptyset)} \sum_{j=0}^{n} m(\emptyset)\Delta^-(0,j)\phi = (n+1)\sum_{j=0}^{n} \Delta^-_{(0,j)}\phi.$$

□

Next, we have a technical tool to calculate to norm and Laplacian of functions in $C^0(X,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$:

Proposition 5.14. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, $(n+1)$-partite, weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension >0 are connected. Let $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$. For every $0 \le i \le n$, define $\phi_i(u) \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$ as follows:*

$$\phi_i(u) = \begin{cases} -n\phi(u) & u \in S_i \\ \phi(u) & \textit{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Then

1. *If $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$, then for every $0 \le i \le n$, we have that $\phi_i(u) \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$.*
2. *For every $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$,*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} \|\phi_i\|^2 = (n^2+n)\|\phi\|^2.$$

3. *For every $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})$,*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} \langle \phi_i, \Delta_0^+ \phi_i\rangle = \langle \phi, ((n+1)^2 I - (n+1)\Delta_0^+)\phi\rangle.$$

Proof. 1. Let $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$. Fix $0 \le i \le n$. Note that for every $0 \le j \le n$, we have that

$$\langle \phi, \chi_{X_j^{(0)}}\rangle = 0 \Rightarrow \langle \phi_i, \chi_{X_j^{(0)}}\rangle = 0,$$

and therefore by the above proposition $\phi_i(u) \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$.

2. For every $0 \le i \le n$ we have that

$$\|\phi_i\|^2 = \sum_{u\in S_i} m(u)n^2\phi(u)^2 + \sum_{u\in X^{(0)}\setminus S_i} m(u)\phi(u)^2.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{i\,=0}^{n} \|\phi_i\|^2 = \sum_{u\in X^{(0)}} m(u)(n^2+n)\phi(u)^2 = (n^2+n)\|\phi\|^2.$$

3. For every $0 \leq i \leq n$, we'll compute $\Delta_0^+ \phi_i$: For $u \in S_i$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta_0^+ \phi_i)(u) &= -n\phi(u) - \sum_{v \in X^{(0)}, (u,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)} \phi(v) \\ &= (-n-1)\phi(u) + (\Delta_0^+ \phi)(u).\end{aligned}$$

For $u \in X^{(0)} \setminus S_i$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta_0^+ \phi_i)(u) &= \phi(u) - \sum_{v \in X^{(0)} \setminus S_i, (u,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)} \phi(v) \\ &\quad - \sum_{v \in S_i, (u,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)} (-n)\phi(v) \\ &= (\Delta_0^+ \phi)(u) + (n+1) \sum_{v \in S_i, (u,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)} \phi(v).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \phi_i, \Delta_0^+ \phi_i \rangle &= \sum_{u \in S_i} m(u)\phi(u) \left(-n(-n-1)\phi(u) - n(\Delta_0^+ \phi)(u)\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{u \in X^{(0)} \setminus S_i} m(u)\phi(u) \Bigg((\Delta_0^+ \phi)(u) \\ &\qquad + (n+1) \sum_{v \in S_i, (u,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)} \phi(v) \Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{n} \langle \phi_i, \Delta_0^+ \phi_i \rangle &= \sum_{u \in X^{(0)}} m(u)\phi(u) \Bigg(n(n+1)\phi(u) - n(\Delta_0^+ \phi)(u) \\ &\qquad + n(\Delta_0^+ \phi)(u) \\ &\qquad + (n+1) \sum_{v \in X^{(0)}, (u,v) \in \Sigma(1)} \frac{m((u,v))}{m(u)} \phi(v) \Bigg) \\ &= \sum_{u \in X^{(0)}} m(u)\phi(u) \left((n+1)^2 \phi(u) - (n+1)(\Delta_0^+ \phi)(u)\right) \\ &= \langle \phi, ((n+1)^2 I - (n+1)\Delta_0^+)\phi \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

□

It is known that for bipartite graph, the spectrum of the Laplacian is symmetric around 1. For $(n+1)$-partite complexes we have a weaker result that shows that the bounds of the non trivial spectrum have some symmetry around 1:

Lemma 5.15. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, $(n+1)$-partite, weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Assume that X is non trivial, i.e., assume that X has more than 1 n-dimensional simplex. Denote*

$$\lambda(X) = \min\{\lambda : \lambda > 0, \exists\phi, \Delta_0^+\phi = \lambda\phi\},$$

$$\kappa(X) = \max\{\lambda : \lambda < \frac{n+1}{n}, \exists\phi, \Delta_0^+\phi = \lambda\phi\}.$$

Then

$$1 - \frac{1}{n}(1-\lambda(X)) \leq \kappa(X) \leq \min\{1 - n(1-\lambda(X)), \frac{n+1}{n}\}.$$

Proof. Let $\phi \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$ by the eigenfunction of $\kappa(X)$. By the above proposition, for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, $\phi_i \in C^0(X,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$ and therefore

$$\langle\phi_i, \Delta_0^+\phi_i\rangle \geq \lambda(X)\|\phi_i\|^2.$$

Summing on i we get

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n}\langle\phi_i, \Delta_0^+\phi_i\rangle \geq \lambda(X)\sum_{i=0}^{n}\|\phi_i\|^2.$$

By the equalities proven in the above proposition, this yields

$$\langle\phi, ((n+1)^2 I - (n+1)\Delta_0^+)\phi\rangle \geq \lambda(X)(n^2+n)\|\phi\|^2.$$

Since we took ϕ to be the eigenfunction of $\kappa(X)$, this yields

$$((n+1)^2 - (n+1)\kappa(X))\|\phi\|^2 \geq \lambda(X)(n^2+n)\|\phi\|^2.$$

Therefore

$$1 + n(1-\lambda(X)) \geq \kappa(X).$$

(Also, recall that $\kappa(X) < \frac{n+1}{n}$). By the same procedure, when ϕ is taken to be the eigenfunction of $\lambda(X)$, we get that

$$((n+1)^2 - (n+1)\lambda(X))\|\phi\|^2 \leq \kappa(X)(n^2+n)\|\phi\|^2,$$

and therefore

$$1 + \frac{1}{n}(1-\lambda(X)) \leq \kappa(X).$$

□

The next theorem is the $(n+1)$-partite analogue of corollary 5.5:

Theorem 5.16. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, $(n+1)$-partite, weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Fix $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, if there are $\kappa \geq \lambda > \frac{k}{k+1}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta_{\tau,0}^+) \setminus \{0, \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\} \subseteq [\lambda, \kappa],$$

then

$$\left\| \Delta_k^+ + \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta_k^- + (k-(k+1)\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2})I \right.$$
$$\left. -(\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k} - (n+1-k)^2\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{(k,j)}^- \right\| \leq (k+1)\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2},$$

where $\|.\|$ *denotes the operator norm.*

Proof. Let $\phi \in C^k(X,\mathbb{R})$, then for every $\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)$, we have that the projection of ϕ_τ on $C^0(X_\tau,\mathbb{R})_{nt}$ is

$$\phi_\tau - (n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-\phi_\tau = (I-(n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-)\phi_\tau.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle \Delta_\tau^+\left(I-(n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-\right)\phi_\tau,\phi_\tau\right\rangle \\
&\geq \lambda\left\|\left(I-(n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-\right)\phi_\tau\right\|^2 \\
&= \lambda\left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2-(n+1-k)^2\sum_{j=0}^{n}\|\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-\phi_\tau\|^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\kappa\left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2-(n+1-k)^2\sum_{j=0}^{n}\|\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-\phi_\tau\|^2\right) \geq \left\langle \Delta_\tau^+\left(I-(n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-\right)\phi_\tau,\phi_\tau\right\rangle.$$

From the fact that $\Delta_{\tau,0}^-$ is the projection on the constant functions on X_τ we get that

$$(n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^- - \Delta_{\tau,0}^-,$$

is the projection of the eigenfunctions with eigenvalue $\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}$. Therefore,

$$\Delta_{\tau,0}^+\left((n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-\right) = \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\left((n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^- - \Delta_{\tau,0}^-\right),$$

which yields

$$\Delta_{\tau,0}^+\left(I-(n+1-k)\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-\right) = \Delta_{\tau,0}^+ + \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta_{\tau,0}^- - \frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{\tau,(0,j)}^-.$$

Therefore we have that

$$\kappa\left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2-(n+1-k)^2\sum_{j=0}^{n}\|\Delta^-_{\tau,(0,j)}\phi_\tau\|^2\right)\geq$$
$$\left\langle\left(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}+\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta^-_{\tau,0}-\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{\tau,(0,j)}\right)\phi_\tau,\phi_\tau\right\rangle\geq$$
$$\lambda\left(\|\phi_\tau\|^2-(n+1-k)^2\sum_{j=0}^{n}\|\Delta^-_{\tau,(0,j)}\phi_\tau\|^2\right).$$

Summing the above inequalities on all $\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)$ and using the equalities:

$$(k+1)!\,\|\phi\|^2=\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\|\phi_\tau\|^2,$$

$$k!\left\langle\Delta^-_k\phi,\phi\right\rangle=\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\left\langle\Delta^-_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau,\phi_\tau\right\rangle,$$

$$k!\,\langle\Delta^+_k\phi,\phi\rangle+k!\,k\|\phi\|^2=\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\langle\Delta^+_{\tau,0}\phi_\tau,\phi_\tau\rangle,$$

$$k!\,\langle\Delta^-_{(k,j)}\phi,\phi\rangle=\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}\langle\Delta^-_{\tau,(0,j)}\phi_\tau,\phi_\tau\rangle,$$

(see lemma 4.4, corollary 4.6 and proposition 4.7), yields (after dividing by $k!$):

$$\kappa\left\langle\left((k+1)I-(n+1-k)^2\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(k,j)}\right)\phi,\phi\right\rangle$$
$$\geq\left\langle\left(\Delta^+_k+kI+\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta^-_k-\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(k,j)}\right)\phi,\phi\right\rangle$$
$$\geq\lambda\left\langle\left((k+1)I-(n+1-k)^2\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(k,j)}\right)\phi,\phi\right\rangle.$$

Subtracting

$$\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\left\langle\left((k+1)I-(n+1-k)^2\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(k,j)}\right)\phi,\phi\right\rangle,$$

from the above inequality yields

$$\left|\left\langle\left(\Delta^+_k+(k-(k+1)\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2})I+\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta^-_k-(\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k}-(n+1-k)^2\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(k,j)}\right)\phi,\phi\right\rangle\right|$$
$$\leq\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\left\langle\left((k+1)I-(n+1-k)^2\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(k,j)}\right)\phi,\phi\right\rangle.$$

This in turn yields

$$\Big\| \Delta_k^+ + \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta_k^- + (k-(k+1)\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2})I \\ -(\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k} - (n+1-k)^2\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{(k,j)}^- \Big\| \leq (k+1)\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}.$$

□

The above theorem, combined with lemma 5.15, yields the following bound based only on the smallest positive eigenvalues of the links.

Corollary 5.17. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, $(n+1)$-partite, weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension >0 are connected. Fix $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, if there is $\lambda > \frac{k}{k+1}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta_{\tau,0}^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \infty),$$

then

$$\Big\| \Delta_k^+ + \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta_k^- - (\frac{2+(n-k)(1-\lambda)}{2})I \\ -(\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k} - (n+1-k)^2\frac{2+(n-k)(1-\lambda)}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{(k,j)}^- \Big\| \leq (k+1)(n \\ +1-k)\frac{1-\lambda}{2},$$

where $\|.\|$ denotes the operator norm.

Proof. Notice that every link is a $(n+1-k)$-partite complex and that by lemma 5.15 we have that in the notations of the above theorem:

$$\kappa \leq 1+(n+1-k)(1-\lambda), \kappa-\lambda \leq (n+1-k)(1-\lambda).$$

Therefore, we get

$$\Big\| \Delta_k^+ + \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta_k^- - (\frac{2+(n-k)(1-\lambda)}{2})I \\ -(\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k} - (n+1-k)^2\frac{2+(n-k)(1-\lambda)}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{(k,j)}^- \Big\| \leq (k+1)(n \\ +1-k)\frac{1-\lambda}{2}.$$

□

6 k-graph of X and random walks

In order to make sense of some of the later results regarding Cheeger type inequalities and mixing, we introduce the some terminology regarding graphs the arise from the simplicial complex X and random walks on these graphs.

6.1 Random walk on finite graphs

Let A be a finite set. A *random walk* on A is a map $\mu : A \times A \to [0,1]$ such that for every $x \in A$ we have $\sum_{y \in A} \mu(x,y) = 1$.
A *stationary measure* of a random walk μ is a strictly positive function $\nu : A \to \mathbb{R}^+$, such that for every $x, y \in A$ we have $\nu(x)\mu(x,y) = \nu(y)\mu(y,x)$. A random walk that has at least one stationary measure is called *reversible*. For a random walk μ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we can define a random walk μ^{*j} as

$$\mu^{*j}(x,y) = \sum_{(x,x_1,\ldots,x_{j-1},y) \in A \times A \times \ldots \times A} \mu(x,x_1)\mu(x_1,x_2)\ldots\mu(x_{j-1},y).$$

Next, let G be a graph $G = (V,E)$ (possibly with loops and multiple edges) and a let c be a strictly positive function $c : E \to \mathbb{R}^+$. Such c is called a conductance function on G. Define a random walk on G with respected to c as follows: for $v \in V, e \in E$ denote $v \in e$ if v is an end of e. Define

$$\forall v \in V, \nu(v) = \sum_{e \in E, v \in e} c(e),$$

$$\mu(u,e) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{c(e)}{\nu(v)} & v \in e \\ 0 & v \notin e \end{cases}.$$

The idea behind this definition is that $\mu(v,e)$ is the probability to choose e when standing at v and walk on e to the other end of it. This is a somewhat refined version of the random walk on the set A presented earlier, because since G might have multiple edges, we get that an edge (or a loop) is not uniquely defined by its end vertices. Notice that for every $v \in V$ we have

$$\sum_{e \in E, v \in e} \mu(v,e) = 1,$$

and that for every $u, v \in V$ and every $e = (u,v)$ we have that

$$\nu(v)\mu(e) = \nu(u)\mu(e).$$

Thus ν is a stationary measure of μ.

6.2 Coarse path random walk, Coarse path conductance

All the definitions regarding random walks above were more or less standard, our next definitions are (as far as we know) new. The main idea here is to break the graph into several pieces and define notions like random walk or conductance

with respect to these pieces.
Let $G = (V, E)$ a weighted graph. For $e \in E$ and $v \in V$ such that $v \in e$ denote

$$e \setminus v = \begin{cases} v & \text{if } e \text{ is a loop} \\ u & e = (u, v), u \neq v \end{cases}.$$

Definition 6.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, a $j+1$-tuple $(v, e_1, e_2, ..., e_j) \in V \times E^j$ is called a path with in G if for every $1 \leq i \leq j$ we have that $v_i \in e_i$, where the v_i's are defined recursively as*

$$v_1 = v, \forall 2 \leq i \leq j, v_{i+1} = e_i \setminus v_i.$$

Denote $Path(G)$ to be the set of all paths in G.

Definition 6.2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $U \subseteq V, E_1 \subseteq E, ..., E_j \subseteq E$. Define*

$$Path(U, E_1, ..., E_j) = \{(u, e_1, ..., e_j) \in Path(G) : u \in U, e_1 \in E_1, ..., e_j \in E_j\}.$$

Definition 6.3. *Let $G = (V, E)$ and $c : E \to \mathbb{R}^+$ as above and let μ, ν the random walk and stationary measure associated to c. Define the coarse path random walk as follows:*

$$path\mu : \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}(V) \times \mathcal{P}(E)^j \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},$$

For $U \subseteq V, E_1, ..., E_j \subseteq E$ define $\mu_{coarse}(U, E_1, ..., E_j)$ as follows:

- *If $Path(U, E_1, ..., E_j) \neq \emptyset$, define*

  $$path\mu(U, E_1, ..., E_j) = \sum_{(v, e_1, ..., e_j) \in Path(U, E_1, ..., E_j)} \mu(v, e_1)\mu(v_2, e_2)...\mu(v_j, e_j),$$

  where $v_1 = v, \forall 2 \leq i \leq j, v_{i+1} = e_i \setminus v_i$.

- *If $Path(U, E_1, ..., E_j) = \emptyset$, define $\mu_{coarse}(U, E_1, ..., E_j) = 0$ (in particular, if $U = \emptyset$ or $E_i = \emptyset$ for some i, then $\mu_{coarse}(U, E_1, ..., E_j) = 0$).*

Also define the coarse path conductance as

$$pathc : \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}(V) \times (\mathcal{P}(E))^j \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},$$

$$pathc(U, E_1, ..., E_j) = \sum_{v \in U} \nu(v) path\mu(\{v\}, E_1, ..., E_j).$$

6.3 Inner connectivity of subgraph

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $c : E \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a conductance function of G. Denote as before μ, ν the random walk and stationary measure induced by c. Given a subgraph of G, $G' = (V', E')$, we want a measure on how much G' in connected within itself. Define the following:

Definition 6.4. *Let $G = (V, E), c : E \to \mathbb{R}^+, \mu, \nu$ as above. Let $G' = (V', E')$ be a subgraph of G. Define the inner connectivity constant of G' in G as*

$$h_{inner}(G'; G) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{pathc(V', E', E')}{pathc(V', E')} & E' \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & E' = \emptyset \end{cases}.$$

By definition for every G' we have that $0 \leq h_{inner}(G'; G) \leq 1$. It is worth noting the following interpretation to $h_{inner}(G'; G)$: when $E' \neq \emptyset$ we get by definition of $pathc(V', E', E'), pathc(V', E')$ that:

$$h_{inner}(G'; G) = \frac{\sum_{v \in V'} \nu(v) \sum_{e \in E', v \in e} \mu(v, e) \sum_{e' \in E', e \setminus v \in e'} \mu(e \setminus v, e')}{\sum_{v \in V'} \nu(v) \sum_{e \in E', v \in e} \mu(v, e)}.$$

Denote $\nu(V') = \sum_{v \in V'} \nu(v)$ and divide both numerator and denominator by $\nu(V')$:

$$h_{inner}(G'; G) = \frac{\sum_{v \in V'} \frac{\nu(v)}{\nu(V')} \sum_{e \in E', v \in e} \mu(v, e) \sum_{e' \in E', e \setminus v \in e'} \mu(e \setminus v, e')}{\sum_{v \in V'} \frac{\nu(v)}{\nu(V')} \sum_{e \in E', v \in e} \mu(v, e)}.$$

Consider the space

$$\Omega = \{(v, e, e') \in Path(G) : v \in V'\},$$

with the probability measure

$$P(v, e, e') = \frac{\nu(v)}{\nu(V')} \mu(v, e) \mu(e \setminus v, e').$$

Then for

$$A_1 = \{(v, e, e') \in \Omega : e \in E'\},$$
$$A_2 = \{(v, e, e') \in \Omega : e' \in E'\},$$

we have

$$h_{inner}(G'; G) = \frac{P(A_1 \cap A_2)}{P(A_1)} = P(A_2 | A_1).$$

Therefore, $h_{inner}(G'; G)$ is exactly the conditional probability that a 2-step random walk with a randomly chosen origin $v \in V'$ stays in G' given that the 1-step random walk a randomly chosen origin $v \in V'$ stayed in G'.

6.4 The k-graph of X

Definition 6.5. *Let X be an n-dimensional simplicial complex. For $-1 \leq k \leq n$, define the k-graph of X denoted as $X_k = (V_k, E_k)$ as following:*

- *The vertices of X_k are k-dimensional (unordered) simplices of X, i.e., $V_k = X^{(k)}$.*
- *For $\{u_0, ..., u_k\}, \{v_0, ..., v_k\} \in V_k$ we have that $(\{u_0, ..., u_k\}, \{v_0, ..., v_k\}) \in E_k$, if there is a $k+1$ simplex $\{w_0, ..., w_{k+1}\} \in X^{(k+1)}$ such that $\{w_0, ..., w_k\} = \{u_0, ..., u_k\}, \{w_1, ..., w_{k+1}\} = \{v_0, ..., v_k\}$.*

Remark 6.6. *We remark that in the above definition there are three special cases worth noting:*

1. *When $k = n$ then $V_n = X^{(n)}$ and $E_n = \emptyset$.*
2. *When $k = 0$ then X_0 is just the 1-skeleton of X.*
3. *When $k = -1$ then X_{-1} is a graph with a single vertex and a loop for every $v \in X^{(0)}$.*

Definition 6.7. *Let X be an n-dimensional simplicial complex. For $l \geq 0$ and non empty sets $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$, define a simplicial complex $X(U_0, ..., U_l)$ on dimension $\min\{l, n\}$ that will be a sub complex of X as follows: for every $0 \leq j \leq n$ we have that $\{u_0, ..., u_j\} \in (X(U_0, ..., U_l))^{(j)}$ if:*

$$\{u_0, ..., u_j\} \in X^{(j)}$$

and

$$\exists\{i_0, ..., i_j\} \subseteq \{0, ..., l\}, |\{i_0, ..., i_j\}| = j + 1, u_0 \in U_{i_0}, ..., u_j \in U_{i_j}.$$

Note that if $l < n$ then by the above definition $(X(U_0, ..., U_l))^{(l+1)} = ... = (X(U_0, ..., U_l))^{(n)} = \emptyset$. $X(U_0, ..., U_l)$ will be called the simplicial complex spanned by $U_0, ..., U_l$.

Definition 6.8. *Let X be an n-dimensional simplicial complex, $l \geq 0$ and $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$ non empty sets. For $k \leq \min\{l, n\}$ define $X_k(U_0, ..., U_l) = (X(U_0, ..., U_l))_k$, i.e., $X_k(U_0, ..., U_l)$ is the k-graph of the simplicial complex spanned by $U_0, ..., U_l$. Notice that since $X(U_0, ..., U_l)$ is a sub complex of X, we get that $X_k(U_0, ..., U_l)$ is a subgraph of X_k.*

Definition 6.9. *Let $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \bigcup_{k=-1}^{n} X^{(k)}$, define*

$$m(A) = \sum_{\tau \in A} m(\tau).$$

For $0 \leq k \leq n$ and $U_0, ..., U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ define

$$m(U_0, ..., U_k) = m(V_k(U_0, ..., U_k)) = \sum_{\tau \in V_k(U_0, ..., U_k)} m(\tau).$$

6.5 Random walk on X_k

Next, we'll define a random walk on X_k given a weight function on X.

Definition 6.10. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with a weight function m. For $-1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ we define a conductance function c_k induced by m on X_k in the following way:*

- *For $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ define*

$$\forall(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in E_k, c_k((\tau_1, \tau_2)) = m(\tau_1 \cup \tau_2).$$

- *As noted before X_{-1} is a graph with a single vertex and a loop for every $v \in X^{(0)}$. Define $c_{-1}(v) = m(v)$ for every $v \in X^{(0)}$.*

Using the conductance function c_k we can define a random walk μ_k and a stationary measure ν_k induced by m:

- *For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$,*

$$\forall \tau_1, \tau_2 \in V_k, \mu_k((\tau_1,\tau_2)) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\tau_1,\tau_2) \notin E_k \\ \dfrac{m(\tau_1 \cup \tau_2)}{(k+1)m(\tau_1)} & (\tau_1,\tau_2) \in E_k \end{cases},$$

$$\forall \tau \in V_k, \nu_k(\tau) = (k+1)m(\tau).$$

- *For $k=-1$, we distinguish between the probability to walk on each loop: for every loop indexed by $v \in X^{(0)}$, the probability to travel trough the loop v is $\mu_{-1}(v) = \frac{m(v)}{m(\emptyset)}$ and we define $\nu(\emptyset) = m(\emptyset)$.*

As in definition 6.3 we can define the coarse path random walk with respect to μ_k, which we'll denote as

$$path\mu_k : \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}(V_k) \times \mathcal{P}(E_k)^j \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

We can also define the coarse path conductance with respect to μ_k, which we'll denote as

$$pathc_k : \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}(V_k) \times \mathcal{P}(E_k)^j \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

We'll see that $path\mu_k, pathc_k$ is easy to compute in some special cases:

Proposition 6.11. *Let $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$, then:*

$$path\mu_{-1}(\emptyset, E_{-1}(U_0), ..., E_{-1}(U_l)) = \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(\emptyset)^{l+1}},$$

$$pathc_{-1}(\emptyset, E_{-1}(U_0), ..., E_{-1}(U_l)) = \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(\emptyset)^{l}}.$$

($m(U_i)$ were defined in definition 6.9).

Proof. Recall that the random walk on X_{-1} is a random walk on a graph with one vertex and a loop for every $u \in X^{(0)}$, where $\mu_{-1}(u) = \frac{m(u)}{m(\emptyset)}$. By this we get

$$path\mu_{-1}(\emptyset, E_{-1}(U_0), ..., E_{-1}(U_l)) = \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(\emptyset)^{l+1}}.$$

Also, recall that by definition

$$pathc_{-1}(\emptyset, E_{-1}(U_0), ..., E_{-1}(U_l)) = \nu(\emptyset) path\mu_{-1}(\emptyset, E_{-1}(U_0), ..., E_{-1}(U_l)),$$

which yields the second equality. □

Proposition 6.12. *For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and any $U_0, ..., U_{k+1} \subseteq X^{(0)}$ we have that*

$$pathc_k(V_k(U_0, ..., U_k), E_k(U_0, ..., U_{k+1})) = (k+1)m(U_0, ..., U_{k+1}).$$

($m(U_0, ..., U_{k+1})$ was defined in definition 6.9).

Proof. Let $\{u_0,...,u_k\} \in V_k(U_0,...,U_k)$ such that $u_0 \in U_0,...,u_k \in U_k$. Recall that

$$\nu_k(\{u_0,...,u_k\}) = (k+1)m(\{u_0,...,u_k\}).$$

For every $u \in U_{k+1}$ such that $\{u_0,...,u_k,u\} \in X^{(k)}$ there are $k+1$ elements $\sigma \in V_k(U_0,...,U_{k+1})$ such that $\{u_0,...,u_k\} \cup \sigma = \{u_0,...,u_k,u\}$. For every such σ, we have that $(\{u_0,...,u_k\},\sigma) \in E_k(U_0,...,U_{k+1})$ and

$$\mu_k((\{u_0,...,u_k\},\sigma)) = \frac{m(\{u_0,...,u_k,u\})}{(k+1)m(\{u_0,...,u_k\})}.$$

Therefore

$$\nu_k(\{u_0,...,u_k\})path\mu_k(\{u_0,...,u_k\},E_k(U_0,...,U_{k+1})) =$$
$$\sum_{u\in U_{k+1},\{u_0,...,u_k,u\}\in X^{(k+1)}}(k+1)m(\{u_0,...,u_k,u\}).$$

Summing on all $\{u_0,...,u_k\} \in V_k(U_0,...,U_k)$ such that $u_0 \in U_0,...,u_k \in U_k$, we get that

$$pathc_k(V_k(U_0,...,U_k),E_k(U_0,...,U_{k+1})) = (k+1)m(U_0,...,U_{k+1}).$$

□

Next we'll define the inner connectivity of $U_0,...,U_k$:

Definition 6.13. *Let $0 \le k \le n-1$ and $U_0,...,U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$. Define*

$$h^k_{inner}(U_0,...,U_k) = \begin{cases} h_{inner}(X_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k);X_{k-1}) & U_0 \neq \emptyset,...,U_k \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}.$$

where $h_{inner}(X_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k);X_{k-1})$ as in definition 6.4.

Remark 6.14. *For the cases $k=0$, $h^0_{inner}(U_0)$ is easy to compute from proposition 6.11):*

$$pathc_{-1}(V_{-1}(U_0),E_{-1}(U_0)) = pathc_{-1}(\emptyset,E_{-1}(U_0)) = m(U_0),$$

$$pathc_{-1}(V_{-1}(U_0),E_{-1}(U_0),E_{-1}(U_0)) = pathc_{-1}(\emptyset,E_{-1}(U_0),E_{-1}(U_0)) = \frac{m(U_0)^2}{m(\emptyset)}.$$

Therefore

$$h^0_{inner}(U_0) = \frac{m(U_0)}{m(\emptyset)}.$$

Proposition 6.15. *Let $1 \le k \le n-1$ and $U_0,...,U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ such that $U_0 \neq \emptyset,...,U_k \neq \emptyset$. Then*

$$pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)) = k(k+1)m(U_0,...,U_k).$$

Proof. For $k=0$, see remark above. Assume that $1 \le k \le n-1$. Note that

$$pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)) =$$
$$= \sum_{i=0}^{k} pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0,...,\widehat{U_i},...,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)).$$

By proposition 6.12 for every i we have

$$pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0,...,\widehat{U_i},...,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)) = km(U_0,...,U_k).$$

Therefore we get

$$pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)) = k(k+1)m(U_0,...,U_k).$$

□

By the definition of $h^k_{inner}(U_0,...,U_k)$ we get the following corollary:

Corollary 6.16. *Let $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $U_0,...,U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ such that $U_0 \neq \emptyset,...,U_k \neq \emptyset$. Then*

$$h^k_{inner}(U_0,...,U_k) = \frac{pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0,..,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,..,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,..,U_k))}{k(k+1)m(U_0,...,U_k)}.$$

7 High order Cheeger-type inequalities

High order Cheeger-type inequalities were already shown for simplicial complexes in [PRT12] and [GS14]. Our treatment differs from previous work since we introduce another factor to the definition of the Cheeger-type constant (see h^k_{inner} below), while previous works only concerned Cheeger-type constants similar to our h^k_{out}.

7.1 1-dimensional Cheeger inequality from a new perspective

First, let us rephrase the idea behind the Cheeger inequality in graphs introducing some new terminology. We'll start with recalling the Cheeger inequality.

Let $G=(V,E)$ be a graph with no isolated vertices. For every $v \in V$, denote $d(v)$ as the valency of v, i.e., $d(v) = |\{(v,u) \in E\}|$. For a set $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V$, denote $|U| = \sum_{u \in U} d(v)$. For $\emptyset \neq V_1 \subseteq V, \emptyset \neq V_2 \subseteq V$, denote

$$E(V_1,V_2) = \{(v_1,v_2) \in E : v_1 \in V_1, v_2 \in V_2\}.$$

The Cheeger constant of G is defined as

$$h(G) = \min\{\frac{|E(U,V \setminus U)|}{|U|} : \emptyset \neq U \subset V, |U| \leq \frac{1}{2}|V|\}.$$

The Cheeger inequality states the following:

Proposition 7.1. *If G is connected and $\lambda(G)$ is the smallest positive eigenvalue of the graph Laplacian Δ^+ of G, then $h(G) \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda(G)$.*

Next, we'll rework the statement in a new terminology. Let X be a 1-dimensional weighted simplicial complex (i.e., X is a weighted graph) with a weight function m. In this case, $X = X_0$ (recall definition 6.5) and m induced a random walk on X as in definition 6.10. For $\emptyset \neq U \subset X^{(0)}$ denote

$$m(U) = \sum_{u \in U} m(u).$$

Definition 7.2. *Let X be a 1-dimensional weighted simplicial complex with a weight function m and no isolated vertices. Let $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq X^{(0)}$. Define*

$$h^0_{out}(U) = \frac{m(U, X^{(0)} \setminus U)}{m(U)},$$

where $m(U), m(U, X^{(0)} \setminus U)$ as in definition 6.9.

If m is the homogeneous weight that assigns each edge in X the weight 1 we get that

$$h^0_{out}(U) = \frac{|E(U, X^{(0)} \setminus U)|}{|U|}.$$

Therefore, when m is the homogeneous weight, $h(X)$ can be written as

$$h(X) = \min\{h^0_{out}(U) : \emptyset \neq U \subset X^{(0)}, |U| \leq \frac{1}{2}|X^{(0)}|\}.$$

In general, we'll write

$$h(X) = \min\{h^0_{out}(U) : \emptyset \neq U \subset X^{(0)}, m(U) \leq \frac{1}{2}m(X^{(0)})\}.$$

Next, we'll want to get rid of the condition $m(U) \leq \frac{1}{2}m(X^{(0)})$ by altering the definition of h. Recall that by definition 6.13 and the remark that follows it, we have for every $U \subseteq X^{(0)}$ that

$$h^0_{inner}(U) = \frac{m(U)}{m(\emptyset)} = \frac{m(U)}{m(X^{(0)})}.$$

Definition 7.3. *Let X be a 1-dimensional weighted simplicial complex with a weight function m and no isolated vertices. Define*

$$h^0(X) = \max\{\varepsilon \geq 0 : \forall \emptyset \neq U \subseteq X^{(0)}, \varepsilon(h^0_{inner}(U)) + h^0_{out}(U) \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

The next proposition shows that a lower bound on $h^0(X)$ is more informative than a lower bound on $h(X)$.

Proposition 7.4. *Let X be a 1-dimensional weighted simplicial complex with a weight function m and no isolated vertices. Then $2h(X) \geq h^0(X)$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall \emptyset \neq U \subseteq X^{(0)}, \varepsilon(h^0_{inner}(U)) + h^0_{out}(U) \geq \varepsilon.$$

For every $\emptyset \neq U \subset X^{(0)}$ with $m(U) \leq \frac{1}{2}m(X^{(0)})$ we get $h^0_{inner}(U) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and therefore $h^0_{out}(U) \geq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$. Since this is true for any such ε we get that $2h(X) \geq h^0(X)$. □

Next, we'll prove the Cheeger inequality in terms of $h^0(X)$ (we basically use the standard proof of the Cheeger inequality, only write it in terms of $h^0(X)$).

Proposition 7.5. *Let X be a 1-dimensional connected weighted simplicial complex with a weight function m. Denote by λ the smallest positive eigenvalue of Δ_0^+ on X, then $h^0(X) \geq \lambda$.*

Proof. Fix $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq X^{(0)}$. Take $\chi_U \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R})$ as the indicator function of U. Then by the fact that X is connected and that Δ^- is the projection on the space of constant functions, we get that

$$\|d\chi_U\|^2 \geq \lambda(\|\chi_U\|^2 - \|\Delta^- \chi_U\|^2).$$

Easy computations give

$$\|d\chi_U\|^2 = m(U, X^{(0)} \setminus U),$$

$$\|\chi_U\|^2 = m(U),$$

$$\|\Delta^- \chi_U\|^2 = \frac{m(U)^2}{m(\emptyset)}.$$

Therefore

$$m(U, X^{(0)} \setminus U) \geq \lambda m(U) - \lambda \frac{m(U)^2}{m(\emptyset)}.$$

Which yields

$$\lambda h^0_{inner}(U) + h^0_{out}(U) \geq \lambda,$$

Since this is true for every $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq X^{(0)}$, we get that $h^0(X) \geq \lambda$. □

7.2 High order Cheeger-type inequalities

Let X be a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with a weight function m. We shall prove an analogue to the connection between $h^0(X)$ and the smallest positive eigenvalue of Δ_0^+. We'll start by defining $h^k_{out}(U_0, ..., U_k)$ for any $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $U_0, ..., U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ (we recall that $h^k_{inner}(U_0, ..., U_k)$ was already defined in definition 6.13).

Definition 7.6. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with a weight function m. For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and any pairwise disjoint non empty sets $U_0, ..., U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ define*

$$h^k_{out}(U_0, ..., U_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & X^{(0)} \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^k U_i = \emptyset \\ \dfrac{m(U_0, ..., U_k, X^{(0)} \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^k U_i)}{m(U_0, ..., U_k)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Next, we will define $h^k(X)$:

Definition 7.7. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with a weight function m. For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ define $h^k(X)$ as follows:*

$$h^k(X) = \max\{\varepsilon \geq 0 : \forall \emptyset \neq U_0, ..., \emptyset \neq U_k \subseteq X^{(0)} \text{ pairwise disjoint}$$

$$\left(\frac{k}{k+1} + \varepsilon\right) h^k_{inner}(U_0, ..., U_k) + \frac{1}{k+1} h^k_{out}(U_0, ..., U_k) \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

Our goal is to give a lower bound on h^k given a large enough Laplacian spectral gap for the links of X. This statement will be made precise in theorem 7.12 and corollary 7.13 below.

Definition 7.8. *For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and any pairwise disjoint sets $U_0, ..., U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ define the indicator k-form of $(U_0, ..., U_k)$, denoted $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k} \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$, as:*

$$\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}((u_0, ..., u_k)) = \begin{cases} sgn(\pi) & \exists \pi \in Sym(\{0, ..., k\}), \forall i, u_{\pi(i)} \in U_i \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}.$$

We remark that if for some i_0 we have that $U_{i_0} = \emptyset$ then $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}$ is the zero k-form.

Lemma 7.9. *For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and any pairwise disjoint sets $U_0, ..., U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ we have that*

1. $$\|\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2 = \begin{cases} m(U_0, ..., U_k) & U_0 \neq \emptyset, ..., U_k \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}.$$

2. *Denote $U_{k+1} = X^{(0)} \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} U_i$, then $d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k} = (-1)^{k+1}\chi_{U_0,...,U_{k+1}}$ and*

$$\|d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2 = \begin{cases} m(U_0, ..., U_{k+1}) & U_0 \neq \emptyset, ..., U_{k+1} \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}.$$

Proof. 1. If there is $0 \leq i_0 \leq k$ such that $U_{i_0} = \emptyset$ then $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k} \equiv 0$ and the statement in the lemma is trivial. Assume that for all $0 \leq i \leq k$, $U_i \neq \emptyset$. Note that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)$ the following holds:

$$\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma)^2 = \begin{cases} 1 & \sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap \left(\bigcup_{\pi \in Sym(\{0,...,k\})} U_{\pi(0)} \times ... \times U_{\pi(k)}\right) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Therefore

$$\|\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2 = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap \left(\bigcup_{\pi \in Sym(\{0,...,k\})} U_{\pi(0)} \times ... \times U_{\pi(k)}\right)} \frac{m(\sigma)}{(k+1)!} =$$

$$= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)} m(\sigma) = m(U_0, ..., U_k).$$

2. If there is $0 \leq i_0 \leq k$ such that $U_{i_0} = \emptyset$ then $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k} \equiv 0$ and therefore $d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k} \equiv 0$ and we are done. Assume that for all $0 \leq i \leq k$, $U_i \neq \emptyset$. Since $d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}$ is antisymmetric, it is enough to show that given $(u_0, ..., u_{k+1}) = \sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)$ such that

$$\forall 0 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq k+1, u_{i_1} \in U_{j_1}, u_{i_2} \in U_{j_2} \Rightarrow j_1 \leq j_2,$$

we have that

$$d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{k+1} & \forall 0 \leq i \leq k+1, u_i \in U_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

There are free cases where

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq k+1, \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_i) = 0$$

which yields $d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma) = 0$:

- If $u_k, u_{k+1} \in U_{k+1}$, then for every $0 \leq i \leq k+1$, σ_i contains at least one vertex in U_{k+1} and therefore $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_i) = 0$.
- If there is i_0 such that $u_{i_0}, u_{i_0+1}, u_{i_0+2} \in U_{j_0}$, then for every $0 \leq i \leq k+1$, σ_i contains at least two vertices in U_{j_0} and therefore $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_i) = 0$.

- If there are i_0, i_1 such that $u_{i_0}, u_{i_0+1} \in U_{j_0}, u_{i_1}, u_{i_1+1} \in U_{j_1}$, then for every $0 \leq i \leq k+1$, σ_i contains at least two vertices in U_{j_0} or in U_{j_1} and therefore $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_i) = 0$.

Excluding the above cases we are left with only two options - either

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq k+1, u_i \in U_i,$$

or there is some $0 \leq i_0 \leq k$ such that

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq i_0, u_i \in U_i \text{ and } \forall i_0 + 1 \leq i \leq k+1, u_i \in U_{i-1}.$$

Note that the first case can not occur if $U_{k+1} = \emptyset$. In the first case:

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq k+1, u_i \in U_i,$$

implies that $\forall 0 \leq i \leq k, \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_i) = 0$ and $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_{k+1}) = 1$. Therefore $d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma) = (-1)^{k+1}$.
In the second case,

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq i_0, u_i \in U_i \text{ and } \forall i_0 + 1 \leq i \leq k+1, u_i \in U_{i-1},$$

implies that $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_i) = 0$ for $i \neq i_0, i_0 + 1$ and that $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_{i_0}) = \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma_{i_0+1}) = 1$. Therefore,

$$d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma) = (-1)^{i_0} + (-1)^{i_0+1} = 0.$$

We conclude that $d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k} = \chi_{U_0,...,U_{k+1}}$. Since we showed $d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k} = \chi_{U_0,...,U_{k+1}}$, we have that $\|d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2 = \|\chi_{U_0,...,U_{k+1}}\|^2$ and therefore the equality for $\|d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2$ is true by 1. .

□

Lemma 7.10. *For $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and any pairwise disjoint sets $U_0, ..., U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ we have for every $0 \leq i_0 \leq k$ and every $\tau \in \Sigma(k-1) \cap \left(U_0 \times ... \times \widehat{U}_{i_0} \times ... \times U_k\right)$ that*

$$\delta\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\tau) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k), \tau \subset \sigma} \frac{m(\sigma)}{m(\tau)} (-1)^{i_0}.$$

We also have that

$$\|\delta\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2 = \frac{1}{k} pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0, .., U_k), E_{k-1}(U_0, .., U_k), E_{k-1}(U_0, .., U_k)).$$

Proof. Fix $0 \leq i_0 \leq k$ and let $\tau = (u_0, ..., u_{k-1}) \in \Sigma(k)$ such that

$$\forall 0 \leq i < i_0, u_i \in U_i, \forall i_0 \leq i \leq k-1, u_i \in U_{i+1}.$$

Then

$$\delta\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\tau) = \sum_{v\in\Sigma(0),v\tau\in\Sigma(k)} \frac{m(v\tau)}{m(\tau)}\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(v\tau) = \sum_{v\in\Sigma(0)\cap U_{i_0},v\tau\in\Sigma(k)} \frac{m(v\tau)}{m(\tau)}\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(v\tau) = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_k),\tau\subset\sigma} \frac{m(\sigma)}{m(\tau)}(-1)^{i_0}.$$

It is easy to see that the support of $\delta\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}$ is contained in $\Sigma(k-1)\cap\bigcup_{i=0}^{k}\bigcup_{\pi\in Sym(\{0,...,k\})} U_{\pi(0)}\times...\times\widehat{U}_{\pi(i)}\times...\times U_{\pi(k)}$. Therefore, by the computation carried above we get that:

$$\|\delta\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2 = \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} \frac{m(\tau)}{k!}\delta\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\tau)^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{k}\sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)\cap\left(U_0\times...\times\widehat{U_i}\times...\times U_k\right)} m(\tau)\left(\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_k),\tau\subset\sigma}\frac{m(\sigma)}{m(\tau)}\right)^2.$$

Note that in the above sum can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{\tau\in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)} m(\tau)\left(\sum_{\sigma\in V_k(U_0,...,U_k),\tau\subset\sigma}\frac{m(\sigma)}{m(\tau)}\right)^2$$

For every $\tau\in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)$ and every $\sigma V_k(U_0,...,U_k)$ such that $\tau\subset\sigma$, there are exactly k elements $\tau'\in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)$ such that $\sigma=\tau\cup\tau'$. By definition of $E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)$ we have that

$$\sum_{\tau\ \in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)} m(\tau)\left(\sum_{\sigma\in V_k(U_0,...,U_k),\tau\subset\sigma}\frac{m(\sigma)}{m(\tau)}\right)^2$$
$$= \sum_{\tau\in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)} m(\tau)\left(\sum_{(\tau,\tau')\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\frac{1}{k}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau')}{m(\tau)}\right)^2$$
$$= \sum_{\tau\in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\ \sum_{(\tau,\tau_1)\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau_1)}{k}\sum_{(\tau,\tau_2)\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\frac{1}{k}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau_2)}{m(\tau)}$$
$$= \sum_{\tau_1\in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\ \sum_{(\tau,\tau_1)\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau_1)}{k}\sum_{(\tau,\tau_2)\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\frac{1}{k}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau_2)}{m(\tau)}$$
$$= \sum_{\tau_1\in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)} m(\tau_1)\sum_{(\tau,\tau_1)\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\frac{1}{k}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau_1)}{m(\tau_1)}\sum_{(\tau,\tau_2)\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\frac{1}{k}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau_2)}{m(\tau)}.$$

Recall that

$$\nu_{k-1}(\tau_1)=km(\tau_1),\mu_{k-1}((\tau_1,\tau))=\frac{1}{k}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau_1)}{m(\tau_1)},\mu_{k-1}((\tau,\tau_2))=\frac{1}{k}\frac{m(\tau\cup\tau_2)}{m(\tau)},$$

and therefore we get

$$\sum_{\tau_1\in V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\frac{1}{k}\nu_{k-1}(\tau_1)\sum_{(\tau,\tau_1)\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\mu_{k-1}((\tau_1,\tau))\sum_{(\tau,\tau_2)\in E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)}\mu_{k-1}((\tau,\tau_2))=$$

$$=\frac{1}{k}pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_k)).$$

□

As a corollary of the two above lemmas we get that:

Corollary 7.11. *For $0\leq k\leq n-1$ and any pairwise disjoint sets $U_0,...,U_k\subseteq X^{(0)}$ we have that:*

$$h^k_{out}=\frac{\|d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2}{\|\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2},$$

and that

$$h^k_{inner}=(k+1)\frac{\|\delta\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2}{\|\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2}.$$

Proof. The first equality is obvious from lemma 7.9. For the second equality - the case $k=0$ is shown in the proof of proposition 7.5. For $k\geq 1$, recall that by corollary 6.16 we have that

$$h^k_{inner}(U_0,...,U_k)=\frac{pathc_{k-1}(V_{k-1}(U_0,..,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,..,U_k),E_{k-1}(U_0,..,U_k))}{k(k+1)m(U_0,...,U_k)}.$$

Therefore the equality follows from lemmas 7.9, 7.10. □

Theorem 7.12. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension >0 are connected. For any $0\leq k\leq n-1$, if there is $\varepsilon>0$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)}Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\}\subseteq[\frac{k}{k+1}+\varepsilon,\infty),$$

then $h^k(X)\geq\varepsilon$.

Proof. The case $k=0$ was already proven in proposition 7.5 (note that although the assumption in proposition 7.5 was that X is 1-dimensional, the proof follows through in the n-dimensional case). Assume that $1\leq k\leq n-1$. Let $U_0,...,U_k\subset X^{(0)}$ be non empty pairwise disjoint sets. By lemma 5.4 we have that

$$\|d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2\geq(k+1)\|\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2\varepsilon-\left(\frac{k}{k+1}+\varepsilon\right)\|\delta\phi\|^2.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{1}{k+1}\left(\frac{k}{k+1}+\varepsilon\right)\frac{\|\delta\phi\|^2}{\|\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2}+\frac{1}{k+1}\frac{\|d\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2}{\|\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}\|^2}\geq\varepsilon,$$

By corollary 7.11 this gives

$$\left(\frac{k}{k+1}+\varepsilon\right)h^k_{inner}(U_0,...,U_k)+\frac{1}{k+1}h^k_{out}(U_0,...,U_k)\geq\varepsilon,$$

and since this is true for any $U_0,...,U_k\subset X^{(0)}$ be non empty pairwise disjoint sets, we get that $h^k(X)\geq\varepsilon$.

□

Now we are ready to state exactly and prove theorem 2.3 stated above:

Corollary 7.13. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. If there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(n-2)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\frac{n-1}{n} + \varepsilon, \infty),$$

then for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, there is $\varepsilon_k(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that $h^k(X) \geq \varepsilon_k$.

Proof. For $k = n-1$, take $\varepsilon_{n-1} = \varepsilon$ and apply theorem 7.12. Assume $0 \leq k \leq n-2$. Denote $f(x) = 2 - \frac{1}{x}$. By corollary 5.2 for every $0 \leq k \leq n-2$ we have that

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [f^{n-k-1}(\frac{n-1}{n} + \varepsilon), \infty).$$

Take $\varepsilon_k = f^{n-k-1}(\frac{n-1}{n} + \varepsilon) - \frac{k}{k+1} > 0$ and apply theorem 7.12 to complete the proof. □

8 Mixing

This section owes its existence to the work done in [Par13] studying mixing for simplicial complexes given spectral gaps of Laplacians. Our results differ from those of [Par13] since the Laplacians we use are different (our Laplacians are normalized with respect to the weight function m). We also prove a mixing result for $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complexes based on local spectral expansion, that is very different in nature to the one proven in [EGL14].

8.1 From Laplacians to coarse paths

Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. For any integer $0 \geq k$ and $U_0, ..., U_k \subseteq X^{(0)}$ disjoint, non empty sets define a k-form $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k} \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ as in the previous section:

$$\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}((u_0, ..., u_k)) = \begin{cases} sgn(\pi) & \exists \pi \in Sym(\{0, ..., k\}), u_{\pi(0)} \in U_0, ..., u_{\pi(k)} \in U_k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Define a projection $\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k} : C^k(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ as

$$\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k}(\phi) = |\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}|\phi, \forall \phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R}),$$

(the multiplication above is point-wise, i.e., for every $\tau \in \Sigma(k)$, $(|\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}|\phi)(\tau) = |\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\tau)|\phi(\tau)$).
For any $k+1$-tuple $U_i, ..., U_{i+k}$ define

$$\Sigma(k)(U_i, ..., U_{i+k}) = \Sigma(k) \cap \left(\bigcup_{\pi\in Sym(\{i,...,i+k\})} U_{\pi(i)} \times ... \times U_{\pi(i+k)}. \right)$$

Define the sign function with respect to $U_0, ..., U_l$ as

$$sgn(U_0, ..., U_l) : \bigcup_{k=0}^{\min\{l,n\}} \bigcup_{i=0}^{l-k} \Sigma(k)(U_i, ..., U_{i+k}) \to \{1, -1\},$$

As

$$\forall (u_0, ..., u_k) \in \Sigma(k)(U_i, ..., U_{i+k}), sgn(U_0, ..., U_l)((u_0, ..., u_k)) = sgn(\pi),$$

where $\pi \in Sym(\{i, ..., i+k\})$ such that $(u_0, ..., u_k) \in U_{\pi(i)} \times ... \times U_{\pi(i+k)}$. Later we'll just write sgn instead of $sgn(U_0, ..., U_l)$ whenever it is clear what are $U_0, ..., U_l$.

Before the next definition, we remark that in this section we allow some abuse of notation, referring to ordered simplices as unordered ones for random walk proposes:

Remark 8.1. *Let $0 \leq k \leq n-1$. We'll allow the following abuse of notation:*

1. *Let $\tau, \tau' \in \Sigma(k)$ such that τ, τ' are not the same simplex up to reordering. If that there is $\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)$ such that $\tau, \tau' \subset \sigma$, denote $m(\tau \cup \tau') = m(\sigma)$.*
2. *Let $\tau, \tau' \in \Sigma(k)$ such that τ, τ' are not the same simplex up to reordering, denote*

$$\mu_k(\tau, \tau') = \begin{cases} \dfrac{m(\tau \cup \tau')}{(k+1)m(\tau)} & \exists \sigma \in \Sigma(k+1), \tau, \tau' \subset \sigma \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}.$$

3. *For $(u_0, ..., u_k) = \tau \in \Sigma(k)$, and $E_1, ..., E_l \subset E_k$, denote*

$$path\mu_k(\tau, E_1, ..., E_l) = path\mu_k(\{u_0, ..., u_k\}, E_1, ..., E_l).$$

Definition 8.2. *Let X, $U_0, ..., U_l$ as above. For $0 \leq k < \min\{l, n\}$ Define the k random walk form $\Psi_k(U_0, ..., U_l) \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ as follows:*

- *For $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)(U_0, ..., U_k)$, define*

$$\Psi_k(U_0, ..., U_l)(\sigma) =$$

$$sgn(\sigma) path\mu_k(\sigma, E_k(U_0, ..., U_{k+1}), ..., E_k(U_{l-k-1}, ..., U_l)).$$

- *For $\sigma \notin \Sigma(k)(U_0, ..., U_k)$, define $\Psi_k(U_0, ..., U_l)(\sigma) = 0$.*

Also define $\Psi_{-1}(U_0, ..., U_l) \in C^{-1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ as

$$\Psi_{-1}(U_0, ..., U_l)(\emptyset) = \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(\emptyset)^{l+1}}.$$

Proposition 8.3. *Let X, $U_0, ..., U_l$ as above. For $0 \leq k < \min\{l, n\} - 1$ we have that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)(U_0, ..., U_k)$ that*

$$\Psi_k(U_0, ..., U_l)(\sigma) = sgn(\sigma) \sum_{\sigma' \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_1 \times ... \times U_{k+1})} \mu_k(\sigma, \sigma') \Psi_k(U_1, ..., U_l)(\sigma').$$

Proof. Note that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k)(U_0, ..., U_k)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\sigma' \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_1 \times ... \times U_{k+1})} \mu_k(\sigma, \sigma') \Psi_k(U_1, ..., U_l)(\sigma') \\
&= \sum_{\sigma' \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_1 \times ... \times U_{k+1})} \mu_k(\sigma, \sigma') path\mu_k(\sigma', E_k(U_1, ...U_{k+2}), ..., E_k(U_{l-k-1}, ...U_l)) \\
&= path\mu_k(\sigma, E_k(U_0, ...U_{k+1}), ..., E_k(U_{l-k-1}, ...U_l)),
\end{aligned}$$

and the claim in the proposition follows.

□

Lemma 8.4. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Let $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $k < l$. Then for any disjoint sets $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$, we have*

$$\frac{(-1)^{(k+1)(l-k)}}{(k+1)^{l-k-1}} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i, ..., U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^+ \right) \chi_{U_{l-k}, ..., U_l} = \Psi_k(U_0, ..., U_l).$$

Proof. We'll prove using induction on l. For $l = k+1$ we have the form $\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k} \Delta_k^+ \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}$. By the definition of $\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k}$ is it is clear that

$$\forall \sigma \in (\Sigma(k) \setminus \Sigma(k)(U_0, ..., U_k)), \mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k} \Delta_k^+ \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) = 0.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k} \Delta_k^+ \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}$ is antisymmetric, it is enough to prove that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)$, the following holds:

$$(-1)^{k+1} \Delta_k^+ \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}} = \Psi_k(U_0, ..., U_{k+1})(\sigma).$$

Recall that

$$\Delta_k^+ \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) = \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) - \sum_{\substack{v \in \Sigma(0) \\ v\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} (-1)^i \frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)} \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(v\sigma_i).$$

Since $\sigma \in (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)$ we get that $\chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) = 0$. Also, since for every $i > 0$, and every v, $v\sigma_i$ contains a vertex in U_0 we get that $\chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(v\sigma_i) = 0$. For σ_0 and every $v \in \Sigma(0)$ such that $v\sigma_0 \in \Sigma(k)$ we have that

$$\chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(v\sigma_0) = \begin{cases} (-1)^k & v \in U_{k+1} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_k^+\chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) &= -\sum_{\substack{v\in U_{k+1}\\ v\sigma\in\Sigma(k+1)}}\frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)}\chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(v\sigma_0)\\ &= (-1)^{k+1}\sum_{\substack{v\in U_{k+1}\\ \sigma v\in\Sigma(k+1)}}\frac{m(\sigma v)}{m(\sigma)}\\ &= (-1)^{k+1}\sum_{\substack{v\in U_{k+1}\\ \sigma v\in\Sigma(k+1)}}\sum_{i=0}^{k}\frac{m(\sigma\cup\sigma_i v)}{(k+1)m(\sigma)}\\ &= (-1)^{k+1}\sum_{\substack{v\in U_{k+1}\\ \sigma v\in\Sigma(k+1)}}\sum_{i=0}^{k}\mu_k(\sigma,\sigma_i v).\end{aligned}$$

Denote $\sigma=(u_0,...,u_k)$ and note that $(\{u_0,...,u_k\},\{v_0,...,v_k\})\in E_k(U_0,...,U_{k+1})$ if and only if there is some $v\in U_{k+1}$ and $0\leq i\leq k$ such that

$$\{v_0,...,v_k\}=\{u_0,...,\widehat{u_i},...,u_k,v\}.$$

Therefore we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(-1)^{k+1}\sum_{\substack{v\in U_{k+1}\\ \sigma v\in\Sigma(k+1)}}\sum_{i\,=0}^{k}\mu_k(\sigma,\sigma_i v) &= (-1)^{k+1}path\mu_k(\sigma,E_k(U_0,...,U_{k+1}))\\ &= (-1)^{k+1}\Psi_k(U_0,...,U_{k+1})(\sigma).\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the case $l=k+1$. Assume now that the claim is true for $l-1$. This assumption implies that:

$$\frac{(-1)^{(k+1)(l-1-k)}}{(k+1)^{l-1-k-1}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}\Delta_k^+\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}=\Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l).$$

This yields

$$\frac{(-1)^{(k+1)(l-k)}}{(k+1)^{l-k-1}}\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}\Delta_k^+\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}=\frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k+1}\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k}\Delta_k^+\Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l).$$

Therefore we are left to prove that

$$\frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k+1}\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k}\Delta_k^+\Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)=\Psi_k(U_0,...,U_l).$$

Again, by the definition of $\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k}$ is is clear that

$$\forall\sigma\in\left(\Sigma(k)\setminus\Sigma(k)(U_0,...,U_k)\right),\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k}\Delta_k^+\Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma)=0.$$

Therefore, it is enough to prove that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)$, the following holds:

$$\frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k+1}\Delta_k^+ \Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma) = \Psi_k(U_0,...,U_l)(\sigma).$$

By the same considerations of the $l = k+1$ case, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_k^+ \Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma) &= - \sum_{\substack{v \in U_{k+1} \\ v\sigma \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \frac{m(v\sigma)}{m(\sigma)} \Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(v\sigma_0) \\
&= (-1)^{k+1} \sum_{\substack{v \in U_{k+1} \\ \sigma v \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \frac{m(\sigma v)}{m(\sigma)} \Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma_0 v) \\
&= (-1)^{k+1}(k+1) \sum_{\substack{v \in U_{k+1} \\ \sigma v \in \Sigma(k+1)}} \frac{m(\sigma v)}{(k+1)m(\sigma)} \Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma_0 v) \\
&= (-1)^{k+1}(k+1) \sum_{\sigma' \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_1 \times ... \times U_{k+1})} \frac{m(\sigma \cup \sigma')}{(k+1)m(\sigma)} \Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma') \\
&= (-1)^{k+1}(k+1) \sum_{\sigma' \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_1 \times ... \times U_{k+1})} \mu_k(\sigma,\sigma') \Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma') \\
&= (-1)^{k+1}(k+1)\Psi_k(U_0,...,U_l)(\sigma).
\end{aligned}$$

Where the last equality is due to proposition 8.3. Therefore

$$\Delta_k^+ \Psi_k(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma) = (-1)^{k+1}(k+1)\Psi_k(U_0,...,U_l)(\sigma),$$

and we are done.

□

Lemma 8.5. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X are of dimension > 0 connected. Let $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $k < l$. Then for any disjoint, non empty sets $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$, we have for*

$$\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^- \right) \chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l} \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R}),$$

that

$$\forall \sigma \in (\Sigma(k) \setminus \Sigma(k)(U_0,...,U_k)), \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^- \right) \chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}(\sigma) = 0,$$

and that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)$,

$$\frac{(-1)^{(l-k)k}}{k^{l-k-1}} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^- \right) \chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}(\sigma) = \Psi_{k-1}(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma_0).$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of the former lemma, therefore will omit some details in the proof. The proof is by induction. Start with $l = k + 1$.From the definition of $\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k}$ it is clear that

$$\forall \sigma \in (\Sigma(k) \setminus \Sigma(k)(U_0, ..., U_k)), \mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k} \Delta_k^- \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) = 0.$$

Therefore, we are left to prove that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)$,

$$(-1)^k \Delta_k^- \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) = \Psi_{k-1}(U_1, ..., U_l)(\sigma_0).$$

Recall that

$$\Delta_k^- \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^i \sum_{v \in \Sigma(0), v\sigma_i \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(v\sigma_i)}{m(\sigma_i)} \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(v\sigma_i).$$

Therefore we get

$$\Delta_k^- \chi_{U_1,...,U_{k+1}}(\sigma) = (-1)^k \sum_{v \in U_{k+1}, \sigma_0 v \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\sigma_0 v)}{m(\sigma_0)}.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq k, \sigma = (u_0, ..., u_k)$ denote $\sigma_{0i} = (u_1, ..., \widehat{u_i}, ..., u_k)$. By this notation we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(-1)^k \sum_{v \in U_{k+1}, \sigma_0 v \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\sigma_0 v)}{m(\sigma_0)} &= (-1)^k \sum_{v \in U_{k+1}, \sigma_0 v \in \Sigma(k)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{m(\sigma_0 \cup \sigma_{0i} v)}{k m(\sigma_0)} \\
&= (-1)^k \sum_{v \in U_{k+1}, \sigma_0 v \in \Sigma(k)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mu_{k-1}(\sigma_0, \sigma_{0i} v) \\
&= (-1)^k \Psi_{k-1}(U_1, ..., U_{k+1})(\sigma_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that the claim is true for $l - 1$. Denote

$$\Phi = \frac{(-1)^{(l-1-k)k}}{k^{l-1-k}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^- \right) \chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}.$$

Again, it is clear that

$$\mathbb{P}_{U_0,...,U_k} \Delta_k^- \Phi$$

vanishes outside $\Sigma(k)(U_0, ..., U_k)$. Let $\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)$. We are left to prove that

$$\frac{(-1)^k}{k} \Delta_k^- \Phi(\sigma) = \Psi_{k-1}(U_1, ..., U_l)(\sigma_0).$$

Recall that

$$\Delta_k^- \Phi(\sigma) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^i \sum_{v \in \Sigma(0), v\sigma_i \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(v\sigma_i)}{m(\sigma_i)} \Phi(v\sigma_i).$$

By the induction assumption Φ vanishes outside $\Sigma(k)(U_1, ..., U_{k+1})$ and therefore we get

$$\Delta_k^- \Phi(\sigma) = (-1)^k \sum_{v \in U_{k+1}, \sigma_0 v \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\sigma_0 v)}{m(\sigma_0 v)} \Phi(\sigma_0 v).$$

By the induction assumption $\Phi(\sigma_0 v) = \Psi_{k-1}(U_2, ..., U_l)(\sigma_{01} v)$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_k^- \Phi(\sigma) &= (-1)^k \sum_{v \in U_{k+1}, \sigma_0 v \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\sigma_0 v)}{m(\sigma_0 v)} \Psi_{k-1}(U_2, ..., U_l)(\sigma_{01} v) \\
&= (-1)^k k \sum_{v \in U_{k+1}, \sigma_0 v \in \Sigma(k)} \frac{m(\sigma_0 \cup \sigma_{01} v)}{k m(\sigma_0 v)} \Psi_{k-1}(U_2, ..., U_l)(\sigma_{01} v) \\
&= (-1)^k k \sum_{v \in U_{k+1}, \sigma_0 v \in \Sigma(k)} \mu_{k-1}(\sigma_0, \sigma_{01} v) \Psi_{k-1}(U_2, ..., U_l)(\sigma_{01} v) \\
&= (-1)^k k \sum_{\sigma' \in \Sigma(k-1) \cap (U_2 \times ... \times U_{k+1})} \mu_{k-1}(\sigma_0, \sigma') \Psi_{k-1}(U_2, ..., U_l)(\sigma') \\
&= (-1)^k k \Psi_{k-1}(U_1, ..., U_l)(\sigma_0),
\end{aligned}$$

and we are done. □

By the two above lemmas we get

Corollary 8.6. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X are of dimension > 0 connected. Let $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $k < l$. For any disjoint sets $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$, denote*

$$pathc_k(U_0, ..., U_l) = pathc_k(V_k(U_0, ..., U_k), E_k(U_0, ..., U_{k+1}), ..., E_k(U_{l-k-1}, ..., U_l)).$$

For any such k, l, we have that

$$\left| \left\langle \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}, \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^+ \right) \chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l} \right\rangle \right| = (k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)} pathc_k(U_0, ..., U_l).$$

In the case $k \geq 1$, we also have

$$\left| \left\langle \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}, \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^- \right) \chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l} \right\rangle \right| = k^{l-1-k} pathc_{k-1}(U_0, ..., U_l).$$

Proof. For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$ as above. Note that $\chi_{U_0,...,U_k}$ is supported on $\Sigma(k)(U_0, ..., U_k)$ and that for every k-form $\phi \in C^k(X, \mathbb{R})$ we have by antisymmetry of k-forms that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}, \phi \rangle &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)} m(\sigma) \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}(\sigma) \phi(\sigma) = \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma(k) \cap (U_0 \times ... \times U_k)} m(\sigma) \phi(\sigma).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by lemma 8.4

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left\langle \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}, \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^+\right) \chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l} \right\rangle\right| \\
&= \left|(-1)^{(k+1)(l-k)}(k+1)^{l-k-1} \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_k)} m(\sigma)\Psi_k(U_0,...,U_l)(\sigma)\right| \\
&= \left|(k+1)^{l-k-2} \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_k)} (k+1)m(\sigma)\Psi_k(U_0,...,U_l)(\sigma)\right| \\
&= \left|(k+1)^{l-k-2} \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_k)} \nu_k(\sigma)\Psi_k(U_0,...,U_l)(\sigma)\right| \\
&= (k+1)^{l-k-2} pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l).
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that $k \geq 1$, then by lemma 8.5 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left\langle \chi_{U_0,...,U_k}, \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}} \Delta_k^-\right) \chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l} \right\rangle\right| \\
&= \left|(-1)^{(l-k)k} k^{l-k-1} \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_k)} m(\sigma)\Psi_{k-1}(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma_0)\right| \\
&= \left|k^{l-k-1} \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_k)} km(\sigma_k)\frac{m(\sigma_k\cup\sigma_0)}{km(\sigma_0)}\Psi_{k-1}(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma_0)\right| \\
&= \left|k^{l-k-1} \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(k)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_k)} \nu_{k-1}(\sigma_k)\mu_{k-1}(\sigma_k,\sigma_0)\Psi_{k-1}(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma_0)\right| \\
&= \left|k^{l-k-1} \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_{k-1})} \nu_{k-1}(\tau) \sum_{\tau'\in\Sigma(k-1)\cap(U_1\times...\times U_k)} \mu_{k-1}(\tau,\tau')\Psi_{k-1}(U_1,...,U_l)(\sigma_0)\right| \\
&= k^{l-k-1} \sum_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)\cap(U_0\times...\times U_{k-1})} \nu_{k-1}(\tau)\Psi_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)(\tau) \\
&= k^{l-k-1} pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8.7. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Let $0 \leq l$. For any disjoint sets $U_0,...,U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$ we have that*

$$\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^-\right)\chi_{U_l} = \frac{m(U_1)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\chi_{U_0},$$

and

$$\left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^-\right)\chi_{U_l}\right\rangle = \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} = pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l).$$

Proof. Recall that for every $\phi \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R})$, $\Delta_0^- \phi$ is the constant function

$$\Delta_0^- \phi \equiv \frac{\sum_{u \in \Sigma(0)} m(u)\phi(u)}{m(X^{(0)})}.$$

Therefore for every non empty set $U \subseteq X^{(0)}$,

$$\Delta_0^- \chi_U \equiv \frac{m(U)}{m(X^{(0)})}.$$

Since for every i, projection the $\mathbb{P}_{U_i}$ is multiplying by χ_{U_i} we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^-\right) \chi_{U_l} &= \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-2} \mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^-\right) \mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^- \chi_{U_l} \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-2} \mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^-\right) \frac{m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})} \chi_{U_{l-1}} \\
&= \frac{m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-2} \mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^-\right) \chi_{U_{l-1}} \\
&= ... \\
&= \frac{m(U_1)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} \chi_{U_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second equality - the first equality combined with $\langle \chi_{U_0}, \chi_{U_0} \rangle = m(U_0)$ gives

$$\left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^-\right) \chi_{U_l} \right\rangle = \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l},$$

and by proposition 6.11, we get that

$$\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} = pathc_{-1}(U_0, ..., U_l).$$

□

8.2 Mixing for two-sided local spectral expansion

Combining the above results with further assumptions of the spectra of the Laplacians in the links gives the following:

Lemma 8.8. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Let $0 \leq k \leq n-1$. Assume that there are $\kappa \geq \lambda > \frac{k}{k+1}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta_{\tau,0}^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \kappa],$$

Then for any $k < l$ and any disjoint sets $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$ we have that:

1. *For $k = 0$,*

$$\left| pathc_0(U_0, ..., U_l) - \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)^l pathc_{-1}(U_0, ..., U_l) \right| \leq l\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)}.$$

2. *For $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, denote*

$$\left| (k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)} pathc_k(U_0, ..., U_l) - \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)^{l-k} k^{l-1-k} pathc_{k-1}(U_0, ..., U_l) \right| \leq (l-k)(k+1)\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\left(\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2}\right)^{l-k-1}\sqrt{m(U_0, ..., U_k)m(U_{l-k}, ..., U_l)}.$$

Proof. The proof is very similar in the both cases - $k = 0$ and $k \geq 1$. We'll write a detailed proof for the case $k = 0$ and in the case $k \geq 1$, we'll sometimes omit some explanations.

1. First, notice that by definition $\Delta_0^- \phi$ is always a constant function and $\Delta_0^- \chi_{X^{(0)}} \equiv 1$. Therefore the spectrum of Δ_0^- is always $\{0, 1\}$. Also, for $k = 0$, we get that

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} = Spec(\Delta_0^+) \setminus \{0\},$$

therefore $Spec(\Delta_0^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \kappa]$.
By corollary 8.6 we have that

$$pathc_0(U_0, ..., U_l) = \left| \left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^+\right) \chi_{U_l} \right\rangle \right|.$$

By lemma 8.7 we have that

$$pathc_{-1}(U_0, ..., U_l) = \left| \left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^-\right) \chi_{U_l} \right\rangle \right| = \left| \left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i} (-\Delta_0^-)\right) \chi_{U_l} \right\rangle \right|.$$

Therefore

$$\left| pathc_0(U_0, ..., U_l) - \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)^l pathc_{-1}(U_0, ..., U_l) \right| \leq \left| \left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i} \Delta_0^+\right) \chi_{U_l} \right\rangle - \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)^l \left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i} (-\Delta_0^-)\right) \chi_{U_l} \right\rangle \right| \leq$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1}\left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)^j\left|\left\langle\chi_{U_0},\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(-\Delta_0^-)\right)\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j}\left(\Delta_0^+ + \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)\Delta_0^-\right)\right)\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^+\right)\chi_{U_l}\right\rangle\right|. \tag{2}$$

Next, note that for every constant $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$\forall 0\le i\le l-2, \mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\alpha I)\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1}}=\alpha\mathbb{P}_{U_i}\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1}}=0.$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(-\Delta_0^-)\right)\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j}\left(\Delta_0^+ + \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)\Delta_0^-\right)\right)\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^+\right)\chi_{U_l}\\ &=\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\frac{1}{2}I-\Delta_0^-)\right)\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j}\left(\Delta_0^+ + \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)\Delta_0^-\right.\right.\\ &\qquad\left.\left.-\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}I\right)\right)\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\Delta_0^+-\frac{\kappa}{2}I)\right)\chi_{U_l}.\end{aligned}$$

By the information we have on the spectrum of Δ_0^+,Δ_0^- we get the following bounds on the operator norms:

$$\|\frac{1}{2}I-\Delta_0^-\|\le\frac{1}{2},\|\Delta_0^+-\frac{\kappa}{2}I\|\le\frac{\kappa}{2}.$$

By corollary 5.5 for the case $k=0$, we have that

$$\left\|\Delta_0^+ + \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)\Delta_0^- - \frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}I\right\|\le\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\frac{1}{2}I-\Delta_0^-)\right)\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j}\left(\Delta_0^+ + \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)\Delta_0^- - \left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)I\right)\right)\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\Delta_0^+-\frac{\kappa}{2}I)\right)\right\|\\ &\le\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^j\left(\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\right)\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{l-1-j}\\ &=\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{\kappa}\right)^j.\end{aligned}$$

This yields the following bound on (2)

$$\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\right)\sum_{j=0}^{l-1}\left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2\kappa}\right)^j\|\chi_{U_0}\|\|\chi_{U_l}\|\le l\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)}.$$

2. By the same considerations as in the $k=0$ case we have for $1\le k\le n-1$ that

$$\left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l)-\left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\right)^{l-k}k^{l-1-k}pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right| =$$
$$\left|\left\langle\chi_{U_0,...,U_k},\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}\Delta_k^+\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}\right\rangle\right.$$
$$\left.-\left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\right)^{l-k}\left\langle\chi_{U_0,...,U_k},\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(-\Delta_k^-)\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}\right\rangle\right| \leq$$
$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1-k}\left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\right)^j$$
$$\left|\left\langle\chi_{U_0,...,U_k},\left(\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(-\Delta_k^-)\right)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j,...,U_{k+j}}\left(\Delta_k^+ + \left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\right)\Delta_k^-\right)\right)\left(\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}\Delta_k^+\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}\right\rangle\right|$$

As before, we can translate by αI for suitable α's in order to get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1-k}\left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\right)^j$$
$$\left|\left\langle\chi_{U_0,...,U_k},\left(\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2\kappa}I-\Delta_k^-)\right)\right.\right.$$
$$\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j,...,U_{k+j}}\left(\Delta_k^+ + \left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\right)\Delta_k^- - (k+1)(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}-\frac{k}{k+1})I\right)\right)$$
$$\left.\left(\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(\Delta_k^+-\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2}I)\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}\right\rangle\right|$$

Recall that

$$Spec(\Delta_k^+)\setminus\{0\}\subseteq[(k+1)\lambda-k,(k+1)\kappa-k],$$

$Spec(\Delta_k^-)\setminus\{0\}\subseteq[k(2-\frac{1}{\lambda})-(k-1),k(2-\frac{1}{\kappa})-(k-1)]=[\frac{(k+1)\lambda-k}{\lambda},\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{\kappa}]$.

Therefore

$$\left\|\Delta_k^+-\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2}I\right\|\leq\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2},$$
$$\left\|\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2\kappa}I-\Delta_k^-\right\|\leq\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2\kappa}.$$

By corollary 5.5, we get that

$$\left\|\Delta_k^+ + \left(\frac{\kappa+\lambda}{2}\right)\Delta_k^- - (k+1)(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}-\frac{k}{k+1})I\right\|\leq(k+1)\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}.$$

Therefore we have the following upper bound on the sum above

$$(k+1)\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_k)m(U_{l-k},...,U_l)}$$
$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1-k}\left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2}\right)^j\left(\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2\kappa}\right)^j\left(\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2}\right)^{l-k-1-j}$$
$$=(k+1)\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\left(\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2}\right)^{l-k-1}\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_k)m(U_{l-k},...,U_l)}$$
$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1-k}\left(\frac{\lambda+\kappa}{2\kappa}\right)^j\leq$$
$$(l-k)(k+1)\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{2}\left(\frac{(k+1)\kappa-k}{2}\right)^{l-k-1}\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_k)m(U_{l-k},...,U_l)}.$$

□

Recall that by corollary 5.2 bounds on the non trivial spectrum of the 1-dimensional links yielded bounds of the non trivial spectrum of the links of all dimensions larger than 1. By this we have the following mixing theorem:

Theorem 8.9. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension >0 are connected. Denote $f(x)=2-\frac{1}{x}$ and f^j to be the composition of f with itself j times (where f^0 is defined as $f^0(x)=x$). Assume there are $\kappa\geq\lambda>\frac{n-1}{n}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(n-2)}Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\}\subseteq[\lambda,\kappa].$$

For every $0\leq j\leq n-1$, denote

$$\lambda_j=f^{n-1-j}(\lambda),\kappa_j=f^{n-1-j}(\kappa),$$
$$r_j=\frac{\lambda_j+\kappa_j}{2},\varepsilon_j=(l-j)(j+1)\left(\frac{(j+1)\kappa_j-j}{2}\right)^{l-j-1}\frac{\kappa_j-\lambda_j}{2}.$$

Then for every $0\leq k\leq n-1$ and for every $k<l$ and any disjoint sets $U_0,...,U_l\subseteq X^{(0)}$ we have that:

$$\left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}\,pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l)-\left(\prod_{j=0}^{k}r_j^{l-j}\right)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\right|$$
$$\leq\sum_{i=0}^{k}\varepsilon_i\left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{k}r_j^{l-j}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_i)m(U_{l-i},...,U_l)}.$$

Proof. We'll prove the theorem by induction on k. For $k=0$, recall that

$$\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}=pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l).$$

By corollary 5.2, we have that

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\}\subseteq[f^{n-1}(\lambda),f^{n-1}(\kappa)].$$

Therefore, by the lemma 8.8, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|pathc_0(U_0,...,U_l)-r_0^l pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right| = \\ &\left|pathc_0(U_0,...,U_l)-\left(\frac{f^{n-1}(\lambda)+f^{n-1}(\kappa)}{2}\right)^l pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right|\leq \\ &l\left(\frac{f^{n-1}(\kappa)}{2}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{f^{n-1}(\kappa)-f^{n-1}(\lambda)}{2}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)}= \\ &\varepsilon_0\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)},\end{aligned}$$

and we are done. Next, assume that the theorem holds for $k-1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l)-\left(\prod_{j=0}^{k}r_j^{l-j}\right)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\right| \\ &\leq\left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l)-r_k^{l-k}k^{l-1-k}pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right| \\ &\quad+r_k^{l-k}\left|k^{l-1-k}pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)-\left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1}r_j^{l-j}\right)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\right| \\ &\leq\left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l)-r_k^{l-k}k^{l-1-k}pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right| \\ &\quad+r_k^{l-k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\varepsilon_i\left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{k-1}r_j^{l-j}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_i)m(U_{l-i},...,U_l)}\end{aligned}$$

By corollary 5.2,

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\}\subseteq[f^{n-1-k}(\lambda),f^{n-1-k}(\kappa)]=[\lambda_k,\kappa_k].$$

And we finish by applying lemma 8.8.

□

Now we are ready to give the exact statement and proof of theorem 2.6 stated above:

Corollary 8.10. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension >0 are connected. If there are $\kappa\geq\lambda>\frac{n-1}{n}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(n-2)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\}\subseteq[\lambda,\kappa].$$

Then for every $1\leq l\leq n$ there are continuous functions $\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda,\kappa),\mathcal{A}_l(\lambda,\kappa)$ such that

$$\lim_{(\lambda,\kappa)\to(1,1)}\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda,\kappa)=0,\ \lim_{(\lambda,\kappa)\to(1,1)}\mathcal{A}_l(\lambda,\kappa)=1,$$

and such that every non empty disjoint sets $U_0, ..., U_l \subseteq X^{(0)}$ the following inequalities holds:

$$\left| m(U_0, ..., U_l) - \mathcal{A}_l(\lambda, \kappa) \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda, \kappa) \min_{0 \leq i < j \leq l} \sqrt{m(U_i) m(U_j)},$$

and

$$\left| m(U_0, ..., U_l) - \mathcal{A}_l(\lambda, \kappa) \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda, \kappa) \left(m(U_0)...m(U_l) \right)^{\frac{1}{l+1}}.$$

Proof. Recall that for every $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ we have by proposition 6.12 that

$$m(U_0, ..., U_l) = \frac{path c_{l-1}(U_0, ..., U_l)}{l+1}.$$

Then by theorem 8.9 with $l, k = l-1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| m(U_0, ..., U_l) - \left(\prod_{j=0}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right) \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \varepsilon_i \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right) \sqrt{m(U_0, ..., U_i) m(U_{l-i}, ..., U_l)} \\
&\leq \sqrt{m(U_0) m(U_l)} \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \varepsilon_i \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right) \sqrt{\frac{m(U_0, ..., U_i)}{m(U_0)} \frac{m(U_{l-i}, ..., U_l)}{m(U_l)}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{m(U_0) m(U_l)} \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \varepsilon_i \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that for every i,

$$m(U_0, ..., U_i) \leq m(U_0), m(U_{l-i}, ..., U_l) \leq m(U_l).$$

Note that for every i,

$$\lim_{(\lambda,\kappa) \to (1,1)} r_i = 1, \lim_{(\lambda,\kappa) \to (1,1)} \varepsilon_i = 0.$$

Therefore, denoting

$$\mathcal{A}_l(\lambda, \kappa) = \prod_{j=0}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda, \kappa) = \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \varepsilon_i \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right),$$

yields the inequality

$$\left| m(U_0, ..., U_l) - \mathcal{A}_l(\lambda, \kappa) \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda, \kappa) \sqrt{m(U_0) m(U_l)},$$

with

$$\lim_{(\lambda,\kappa) \to (1,1)} \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda, \kappa) = 0, \lim_{(\lambda,\kappa) \to (1,1)} \mathcal{A}_l(\lambda, \kappa) = 1.$$

Note that by definition of $m(U_0,...,U_l)$, we have any reordering $\pi \in Sym(\{0,...,l\})$ that

$$m(U_0,...,U_l) = m(U_{\pi(0)},...,U_{\pi(l)})$$

Therefore, for every $0 \leq i < j \leq l$, we have

$$\left| m(U_0,...,U_l) - \mathcal{A}_l(\lambda,\kappa)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda,\kappa)\sqrt{m(U_i)m(U_j)}.$$

Taking i,j such that $m(U_i)m(U_j)$ is minimal yields the first inequality stated above. Next, multiply the inequalities for all the different choices of $0 \leq i < j \leq l$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\left| m(U_0,...,U_l) - \mathcal{A}_l(\lambda,\kappa)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} \right|\right)^{\frac{l(l+1)}{2}} \\ &\leq (\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda,\kappa))^{\frac{l(l+1)}{2}} \sqrt{m(U_0)^l...m(U_l)^l}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking both sides to the power $\frac{2}{l(l+1)}$ yields the second inequality stated above. □

8.3 Mixing for partite simplicial complexes

The above mixing result dealt with general simplicial complexes. Here we deal with mixing for $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complexes, which is an analogue to mixing in bipartite graphs. The proof of the mixing results is very similar to the proofs of the mixing in the general case, but relays on corollary 5.17 instead of corollary 5.5 that was used in the general case. For the convenience of the reader, we shall repeat all the arguments in the proofs even where there is a substantial overlap with the arguments given in the proofs of the mixing in the general case.

Lemma 8.11. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, weighted, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Denote by $S_0,...,S_n$ the sides of X. Let $0 \leq k \leq n-1$. Assume that there is $\lambda > \frac{k}{k+1}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda,\infty),$$

Then for any $k < l \leq n$ and any disjoint sets $U_0 \subseteq S_0,...,U_l \subseteq S_l$ we have that:

1. *For $k = 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\left| pathc_0(U_0,...,U_l) - \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^l pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l) \right| \\ &\leq l\left(\frac{n+1}{2n}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{(n+1)(1-\lambda)}{2}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)}.\end{aligned}$$

2. *For* $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, *denote*

$$\Big|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)} pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l)$$
$$-\left(\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\right)^{l-k} k^{l-1-k} pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\Big| \leq$$
$$(l-k)(k+1)(n+1-k)\frac{1-\lambda}{2}\left(\frac{n+1}{2(n-k)}\right)^{l-k}\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_k)m(U_{l-k},...,U_l)}.$$

Proof. The proof is very similar in the both cases - $k=0$ and $k \geq 1$. We'll write a detailed proof for the case $k=0$ and in the case $k \geq 1$, we'll sometimes omit some explanations.

1. First, notice that by definition $\Delta_0^- \phi$ is always a constant function and $\Delta_0^- \chi_{X^{(0)}} \equiv 1$. Therefore the spectrum of Δ_0^- is always $\{0,1\}$. Also, for $k=0$, we get that

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} = Spec(\Delta_0^+) \setminus \{0\},$$

therefore $Spec(\Delta_0^+) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \frac{n+1}{n}]$, where the upper bound is due to corollary 5.7.
By corollary 8.6 we have that

$$pathc_0(U_0,...,U_l) = \left|\left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^+\right)\chi_{U_l}\right\rangle\right|.$$

By lemma 8.7 we have that

$$pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l) = \left|\left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^-\right)\chi_{U_l}\right\rangle\right| = \left|\left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(-\Delta_0^-)\right)\chi_{U_l}\right\rangle\right|.$$

Therefore

$$\left|pathc_0(U_0,...,U_l) - \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^l pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right|$$
$$\leq \left|\left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^+\right)\chi_{U_l}\right\rangle\right.$$
$$\left. - \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^l \left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(-\Delta_0^-)\right)\chi_{U_l}\right\rangle\right|$$
$$\leq$$
$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1}\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^j \left|\left\langle \chi_{U_0}, \prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(-\Delta_0^-)\right)\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j}\left(\Delta_0^+ + \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)\Delta_0^-\right)\right)\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^+\right)\chi_{U_l}\right\rangle\right|. \tag{3}$$

Next, note for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq l-2, \mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\alpha I)\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1}} = \alpha \mathbb{P}_{U_i}\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1}} = 0.$$

Also, for any constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any $0 \leq j \leq n$, we have by corollary 3.15 that

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq l-2, \mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\alpha \Delta^-_{(0,j)})\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1}} = \alpha \mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta^-_{(0,j)}\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1}} = 0,$$

(note that here we are using the assumption that $U_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., U_l \subseteq S_l$). Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(-\Delta_0^-)\right)\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j}\left(\Delta_0^+ + \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)\Delta_0^-\right)\right)\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}\Delta_0^+\right)\chi_{U_l} \\
&= \prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\frac{1}{2}I - \Delta_0^-)\right) \\
&\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j}\left(\Delta_0^+ + \frac{n+1}{n}\Delta_0^- - \frac{2+n(1-\lambda)}{2}I - (\frac{(n+1)^2}{n} - (n+1)^2\frac{2+n(1-\lambda)}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(0,j)}\right)\right) \\
&\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\Delta_0^+ - \frac{n+1}{2n}I)\right)\chi_{U_l}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the information we have on the spectrum of Δ_0^+, Δ_0^- we get the following bounds on the operator norms:

$$\|\frac{1}{2}I - \Delta_0^-\| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \|\Delta_0^+ - \frac{n+1}{2n}I\| \leq \frac{n+1}{2n}.$$

By corollary 5.17 for the case $k = 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\|\Delta_0^+ + \frac{n+1}{n}\Delta_0^- - \frac{2+n(1-\lambda)}{2}I \\
&\quad - (\frac{(n+1)^2}{n} - (n+1)^2\frac{2+n(1-\lambda)}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(0,j)}\Big\| \leq \frac{(n+1)(1-\lambda)}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Bigg\|\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\frac{1}{2}I - \Delta_0^-)\right) \\
&\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j}\left(\Delta_0^+ + \frac{n+1}{n}\Delta_0^- - \frac{2+n(1-\lambda)}{2}I - (\frac{(n+1)^2}{n} - (n+1)^2\frac{2+n(1-\lambda)}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta^-_{(0,j)}\right)\right) \\
&\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-1}\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_i}(\Delta_0^+ - \frac{n+1}{2n}I)\right)\Bigg\| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^j\left(\frac{(n+1)(1-\lambda)}{2}\right)\left(\frac{n+1}{2n}\right)^{l-1-j} \\
&= \left(\frac{n+1}{2n}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{(n+1)(1-\lambda)}{2}\right)\left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right)^j.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields the following bound on (3)

$$\left(\frac{n+1}{2n}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{(n+1)(1-\lambda)}{2}\right)\sum_{j=0}^{l-1}\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^{j}\left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right)^{j}\|\chi_{U_0}\|\|\chi_{U_l}\|=$$
$$l\left(\frac{n+1}{2n}\right)^{l-1}\left(\frac{(n+1)(1-\lambda)}{2}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)}.$$

2. By the same considerations as in the $k=0$ case we have for $1\leq k\leq n-1$ that

$$\left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l)-\left(\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\right)^{l-k}k^{l-1-k}pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right|=$$
$$\left|\left\langle\chi_{U_0,...,U_k},\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}\Delta_k^+\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}\right\rangle\right.$$
$$\left.-\left(\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\right)^{l-k}\left\langle\chi_{U_0,...,U_k},\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(-\Delta_k^-)\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}\right\rangle\right|\leq$$
$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1-k}\left(\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\right)^{j}$$
$$\left|\left\langle\chi_{U_0,...,U_k},\left(\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(-\Delta_k^-)\right)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j,...,U_{k+j}}\left(\Delta_k^+\left(\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\right)\Delta_k^-\right)\right)\left(\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}\Delta_k^+\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}\right\rangle\right|$$

As before, note for any $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$\forall 0\leq i\leq l-k-1,\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(\alpha I)\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1},...,U_{k+i+1}}=\alpha\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1},...,U_{k+i+1}}=0.$$

Also, for any $0\leq j\leq n$, we have by corollary 3.15 that

$$\forall 0\leq i\leq l-2,\forall 0\leq i\leq l-k-1,\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(\alpha\Delta_{(0,j)}^-)\mathbb{P}_{U_{i+1},...,U_{k+i+1}}=0,$$

(note that here we are using the assumption that $U_0\subseteq S_0,...,U_l\subseteq S_l$). Therefore we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1-k}\left(\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\right)^{j}$$
$$\left|\left\langle\chi_{U_0,...,U_k},\left(\prod_{i=0}^{j-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(\frac{n+1}{2(n+1-k)}I-\Delta_k^-)\right)\left(\mathbb{P}_{U_j,...,U_{k+j}}\left(\Delta_k^++\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta_k^-\right.\right.\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left.\left.\left.-(\frac{2+(n-k)(1-\lambda)}{2})I-(\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k}-(n+1-k)^2\frac{2+(n-k)(1-\lambda)}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{(k,j)}^-\right)\right)\right.$$
$$\left.\left(\prod_{i=j+1}^{l-k-1}\mathbb{P}_{U_i,...,U_{k+i}}(\Delta_k^+-\frac{n+1}{2(n-k)}I)\right)\chi_{U_{l-k},...,U_l}\right\rangle\right|$$

Recall that

$$Spec(\Delta_k^+) \subseteq \left[0, \frac{n+1}{n-k}\right],$$

$$Spec(\Delta_k^-) \subseteq \left[0, \frac{n+1}{n+1-k}\right].$$

Therefore

$$\left\|\Delta_k^+ - \frac{n+1}{2(n-k)}I\right\| \leq \frac{n+1}{2(n-k)},$$

$$\left\|\frac{n+1}{2(n+1-k)}I - \Delta_k^-\right\| \leq \frac{n+1}{2(n+1-k)}.$$

By corollary 5.17, we get that

$$\left\|\Delta_k^+ + \frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\Delta_k^- - (\frac{2+(n-k)(1-\lambda)}{2})I \right.$$
$$\left. - (\frac{(n+1-k)^2}{n-k} - (n+1-k)^2\frac{2+(n-k)(1-\lambda)}{2})\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Delta_{(k,j)}^-\right\| \leq (k$$
$$+1)(n+1-k)\frac{1-\lambda}{2}.$$

Therefore we have the following upper bound on the sum above

$$(k+1)(n+1-k)\frac{1-\lambda}{2}\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_k)m(U_{l-k},...,U_l)}$$
$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1-k}\left(\frac{n+1-k}{n-k}\right)^j\left(\frac{n+1}{2(n+1-k)}\right)^j\left(\frac{n+1}{2(n-k)}\right)^{l-k-1-j}$$
$$=(l-k)(k+1)(n+1-k)\frac{1-\lambda}{2}\left(\frac{n+1}{2(n-k)}\right)^{l-k}\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_k)m(U_{l-k},...,U_l)}.$$

□

Using corollary 5.2 we can show the following mixing theorem:

Theorem 8.12. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, weighted, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Denote by $S_0,...,S_n$ the sides of X. Denote $f(x) = 2 - \frac{1}{x}$ and f^j to be the composition of f with itself j times (where f^0 is defined as $f^0(x) = x$). Assume there is $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(n-2)} Spec(\Delta_{\tau,0}^+)\setminus\{0\} \subseteq [\lambda,\infty).$$

For every $0 \leq j \leq n-1$, denote

$$\lambda_j = f^{n-1-j}(\lambda), \varepsilon_j = (l-j)\left(\frac{n+1}{2(n-j)}\right)^{l-j}(j+1)(n+1-j)\frac{1-\lambda_j}{2},$$

$$r_j = \left(\frac{n+1-j}{n-j}\right)^{l-j}.$$

Then for every $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and for every $k < l \leq n$ and any disjoint sets $U_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., U_l \subseteq S_l$ we have that:

$$\left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}\, pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l) - \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k} r_j^{l-j}\right)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\right|$$
$$\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k}\varepsilon_i\left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{k} r_j^{l-j}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_i)m(U_{l-i},...,U_l)}.$$

Proof. We'll prove the theorem by induction on k. For $k=0$, recall that

$$\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} = pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l).$$

By corollary 5.2, we have that

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\} \subseteq [f^{n-1}(\lambda),\infty).$$

Therefore, by the lemma 8.11, we get that

$$\left|pathc_0(U_0,...,U_l) - \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^l pathc_{-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right|$$
$$\leq l\left(\frac{n+1}{2n}\right)^l\left(\frac{(n+1)(1-f^{n-1}(\lambda))}{2}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)}$$
$$= \varepsilon_0\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)},$$

and we are done. Next, assume that the theorem holds for $k-1$, then we have

$$\left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l) - \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k} r_j^{l-j}\right)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\right|$$
$$\leq \left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l) - r_k^{l-k}k^{l-1-k}pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right|$$
$$+ r_k^{l-k}\left|k^{l-1-k}pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l) - \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} r_j^{l-j}\right)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l}\right|$$
$$\leq \left|(k+1)^{l-1-(k+1)}pathc_k(U_0,...,U_l) - r_k^{l-k}k^{l-1-k}pathc_{k-1}(U_0,...,U_l)\right|$$
$$+ r_k^{l-k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\varepsilon_i\left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{k-1} r_j^{l-j}\right)\sqrt{m(U_0,...,U_i)m(U_{l-i},...,U_l)}.$$

By corollary 5.2,

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(k-1)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0})\setminus\{0\} \subseteq [f^{n-1-k}(\lambda),\infty) = [\lambda_k,\infty).$$

And we finish by applying lemma 8.11.

□

Now we are ready to give the exact statement and proof of theorem 2.10 stated above:

Corollary 8.13. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, weighted, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. Denote by $S_0, ..., S_n$ the sides of X. If there is $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{\tau \in \Sigma(n-2)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda, \infty).$$

Then for every $1 \leq l \leq n$, there is a continuous function $\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda)$ such that

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 1} \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda) = 0,$$

and such that every non empty disjoint sets $U_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., U_l \subseteq S_l$ the following inequalities holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{m(U_0, ..., U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})} - \frac{1}{(n+1)n(n-1)...(n-l+1)} \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)} \right| \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda) \min_{0 \leq i < j \leq l} \sqrt{\frac{m(U_i)m(U_j)}{m(S_i)m(S_j)}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{m(U_0, ..., U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})} - \frac{1}{(n+1)n(n-1)...(n-l+1)} \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)} \right| \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda) \left(\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)}) \right)^{\frac{1}{l+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that for every $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ we have by proposition 6.12 that

$$m(U_0, ..., U_l) = \frac{pathc_{l-1}(U_0, ..., U_l)}{l+1}.$$

Then by theorem 8.12 with $l, k = l-1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| m(U_0, ..., U_l) - \left(\prod_{j=0}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right) \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^l} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \varepsilon_i \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right) \sqrt{m(U_0, ..., U_i)m(U_{l-i}, ..., U_l)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)} \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \varepsilon_i \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right) \sqrt{\frac{m(U_0, ..., U_i)}{m(U_0)} \frac{m(U_{l-i}, ..., U_l)}{m(U_l)}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)} \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \varepsilon_i \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1} r_j^{l-j} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that for every i,

$$m(U_0, ..., U_i) \leq m(U_0), m(U_{l-i}, ..., U_l) \leq m(U_l).$$

Dividing the above inequality by $m(X^{(0)})$ yields

$$\left|\frac{m(U_0,...,U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})}-\left(\prod_{j=0}^{l-1}r_j^{l-j}\right)\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})^{l+1}}\right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)}}{m(X^{(0)})}\sum_{i=0}^{l-1}\varepsilon_i\left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1}r_j^{l-j}\right).$$

Note that

$$\prod_{j\,=0}^{l-1}r_j^{l-j}=\left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^l\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)^{l-1}...\left(\frac{n-l+2}{n-l+1}\right) =\frac{(n+1)^l}{n(n-1)...(n-l+1)}.$$

Also note that by the proposition 3.5 we have for every $0\leq i\leq n$ that

$$m(S_i)=\frac{m(X^{(0)})}{n+1}.$$

Therefore we can write the above inequality as

$$\left|\frac{m(U_0,...,U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})}-\frac{1}{(n+1)n(n-1)...(n-l+1)}\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)}\right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{m(U_0)m(U_l)}}{m(X^{(0)})}\sum_{i=0}^{l-1}\varepsilon_i\left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1}r_j^{l-j}\right) =\sqrt{\frac{m(U_0)m(U_l)}{m(S_0)m(S_l)}}(n+1)\sum_{i=0}^{l-1}\varepsilon_i\left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1}r_j^{l-j}\right).$$

Note that for every i,

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 1}\varepsilon_i=0.$$

Therefore, denoting

$$\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda)=(n+1)\sum_{i=0}^{l-1}\varepsilon_i\left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{l-1}r_j^{l-j}\right),$$

yields the inequality

$$\left|\frac{m(U_0,...,U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})}-\frac{1}{(n+1)n(n-1)...(n-l+1)}\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)}\right| \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda)\sqrt{\frac{m(U_0)m(U_l)}{m(S_0)m(S_l)}}.$$

with

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 1}\mathcal{E}_l(\lambda)=0.$$

Note that by definition of $m(U_0, ..., U_l)$, we have any reordering $\pi \in Sym(\{0, ..., l\})$ that

$$m(U_0, ..., U_l) = m(U_{\pi(0)}, ..., U_{\pi(l)})$$

Therefore, for every $0 \leq i < j \leq l$, we have

$$\left| \frac{m(U_0, ..., U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})} - \frac{1}{(n+1)n(n-1)...(n-l+1)} \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda) \sqrt{\frac{m(U_i)m(U_j)}{m(S_i)m(S_j)}}.$$

Taking i, j such that $m(U_i)m(U_j)$ is minimal yields the first inequality stated above. Next, multiply the inequalities for all the different choices of $0 \leq i < j \leq l$:

$$\left| \frac{m(U_0, ..., U_l)}{m(X^{(0)})} - \frac{1}{(n+1)n(n-1)...(n-l+1)} \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)} \right|^{\frac{l(l+1)}{2}} \leq \mathcal{E}_l(\lambda)^{\frac{l(l+1)}{2}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_l)}{m(S_0)...m(S_l)}} \right)^l.$$

Taking both sides to the power $\frac{2}{l(l+1)}$ yields the second inequality stated above. □

9 Geometric overlap property

In [Gro10], Gromov defined the geometric overlap property for complexes. We'll define a weighted analogue of this property. We shall need the following definition first:

Definition 9.1. *Let X be an n-dimensional simplicial complex and let $\phi : X^{(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a map. The geometric extension of ϕ is the unique map $\widetilde{\phi} : X \to \mathbb{R}^n$ that extends ϕ affinely, i.e., for every $0 \leq l \leq n$ and every $\{u_0, ..., u_l\} \in X^{(l)}$, $\widetilde{\phi}$ maps $\{u_0, ..., u_l\}$ to the simplex in $\mathbb{R}^n$ spanned by $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_l)$.*

Using the above definition, the geometrical overlap property is defined as follows:

Definition 9.2. *Let X be a n-dimensional simplicial complex and let $\varepsilon > 0$. We shall say that X has the ε-geometric overlap if for every map $\phi : X^{(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and for the geometric extension $\widetilde{\phi}$ of ϕ, there is a point $O \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$|\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : O \in \widetilde{\phi}(\sigma)\}| \geq \varepsilon |X^{(n)}|.$$

Generalizing to the weighted setting, the weighted geometrical overlap property is defined as follows:

Definition 9.3. *Let X be a weighted n-dimensional simplicial complex with a weight function m and let $\varepsilon > 0$. We shall say that X has the weighted ε-geometric overlap if for every map $\phi : X^{(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and for the geometric extension $\widetilde{\phi}$ of ϕ, there is a point $O \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$m(\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : O \in \widetilde{\phi}(\sigma)\}) \geq \varepsilon m(X^{(n)}).$$

Remark 9.4. *When m is the homogeneous weight, we have that $m(X^{(n)}) = |X^{(n)}|$ and the weighted definition coincides with the non-weighted definition.*

The aim of this section is to show that mixing results above imply weighted geometric overlap, both for the general case of mixing and for $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complexes.

9.1 Geometric overlap from mixing for general simplicial complexes

We shall start by quoting the following result from the appendix:

Theorem (A.9)**.** *Let V be a finite set and $m : V \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be some fixed map. Then for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are constants $\omega(n) > 0, c(n) > 0$ such that for every $\phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$, one of the following holds:*

1. *There is $u \in V$ such that*
$$m(u) \geq \omega(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(V).$$
2. *There are pairwise disjoint sets $Q_0, ..., Q_n \subset V$ such that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$,*
$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(V),$$
and
$$\bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n)\in Q_0\times...\times Q_n} \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)) \neq \emptyset,$$
where $\overline{conv}(u_0, ..., u_n)$ is the closure of the convex hull of $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)$ (i.e., the closed simplex spanned by $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$).

Based on the above, we shall prove the following:

Theorem 9.5. *Let X be a weighted n-dimensional simplicial complex with a weight function m. Assume that are constants $0 < \mathcal{A}_n, 0 \leq \mathcal{E}_n$ such that for every pairwise disjoint, non empty sets $U_0, ..., U_n \subset X^{(0)}$ the following holds:*

$$\left| m(U_0, ..., U_n) - \mathcal{A}_n \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_n)}{m(X^{(0)})^n} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_n \left(m(U_0)...m(U_n)\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}.$$

Assume farther that

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_n}{\mathcal{A}_n} < \left(\frac{c(n)}{2(n+1)}\right)^n,$$

where $c(n)$ is the constant mentioned in theorem A.9 above. Then X has weighted ε-geometric overlap with

$$\varepsilon = \min\left\{\frac{\omega(n)}{2(n+1)^2}, \mathcal{A}_n \frac{n!\, c(n)}{2}\left(\left(\frac{c(n)}{2(n+1)}\right)^n - \frac{\mathcal{E}_n}{\mathcal{A}_n}\right)\right\},$$

where $\omega(n), c(n)$ are the constants mentioned in theorem A.9 above.

Proof. Fix $\phi : X^{(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^n$. If there is $u \in X^{(0)}$ such that

$$m(u) \geq \omega(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(X^{(0)}).$$

Then for $O = \phi(u)$ we have that (using proposition 3.5)

$$\begin{aligned} m(\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : O \in \widetilde{\phi}(\sigma)\}) &\geq m(\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : u \in \sigma\}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!}m(u) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n!}\omega(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(X^{(0)}). \end{aligned}$$

Using proposition 3.5 again to deduce

$$m(X^{(0)}) = (n+1)!\, m(X^{(n)}),$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned} m(\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : O \in \widetilde{\phi}(\sigma)\}) &\geq \omega(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)^2}m(X^{(n)}) \\ &\geq \varepsilon m(X^{(n)}). \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that for every $u \in X^{(0)}$, we have that

$$m(u) < \omega(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(X^{(0)}).$$

By theorem A.9 stated above we have that there pairwise disjoints sets $Q_0, ..., Q_n$ such that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$,

$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(X^{(0)}),$$

and

$$\bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n)\in Q_0\times...\times Q_n} \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)) \neq \emptyset.$$

By our assumption on mixing, we also have

$$\left| m(Q_0, ..., Q_n) - \mathcal{A}_l \frac{m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)}{m(X^{(0)})^n} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_n \left(m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}.$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} m(Q_0, ..., Q_n) &\geq \mathcal{A}_n \left(\frac{m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)}{m(X^{(0)})^n} - \frac{\mathcal{E}_n}{\mathcal{A}_n} \left(m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{A}_n \left(m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \left(\left(\frac{\left(m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{m(X^{(0)})} \right)^n - \frac{\mathcal{E}_n}{\mathcal{A}_n} \right) \\ &\geq \mathcal{A}_n \frac{c(n)}{2(n+1)} m(X^{(0)}) \left(\left(\frac{c(n)}{2(n+1)} \right)^n - \frac{\mathcal{E}_n}{\mathcal{A}_n} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{A}_n \frac{n!\, c(n)}{2} \left(\left(\frac{c(n)}{2(n+1)} \right)^n - \frac{\mathcal{E}_n}{\mathcal{A}_n} \right) m(X^{(n)}) \\ &\geq \varepsilon m(X^{(n)}). \end{aligned}$$

(Again, we used the fact that $m(X^{(0)}) = (n+1)!\, m(X^{(n)})$)

□

Now we are ready to give the exact statement and the proof of theorem 2.8 stated above:

Corollary 9.6. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional weighted simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. There is a continuous function $\varepsilon(\lambda,\kappa) : [0,1] \times [1,2] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that:*

- *We have that*

$$\lim_{(\lambda,\kappa)\to(1,1)} \varepsilon(\lambda,\kappa) = \min\left\{\frac{\omega(n)}{2(n+1)^2}, \frac{n!\,c(n)}{2}\left(\frac{c(n)}{2(n+1)}\right)^n\right\} > 0,$$

  when $c(n), \omega(n)$ is the constants as in the above theorem.

- *For a given κ, λ if $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$, $\varepsilon(\lambda,\kappa) > 0$, and*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(n-2)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda,\kappa],$$

  then X has $\varepsilon(\lambda,\kappa)$-geometric overlap.

Proof. Combine the above theorem with corollary 8.10. □

9.2 Geometric overlap from mixing for partite complexes

The proof of geometric overlap as a consequence of mixing in the $(n+1)$-partite case is almost the same as in the general case. For the convenience of the reader we will repeat all the arguments. First, let us recall the weighted version of Pach's theorem for the $(n+1)$-partite case proven in the appendix:

Theorem (A.1)**.** *Let V be a finite set and $m : V \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be some fixed map. For $U \subseteq V$, denote*

$$m(U) = \sum_{u\in U} m(u).$$

Then for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are constants $0 < \omega(n) \leq 1, c(n) > 0$ such that for every $\phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and every disjoint partition of V, $S_0, ..., S_n$, one of the following holds:

1. *There is a vertex $u \in V$ such that*

$$m(u) \geq \omega(n) \min\{m(S_0), ..., m(S_n)\}.$$

2. *There are sets $Q_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq S_n$ such that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n)m(S_i),$$

   and

$$\bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n)\in Q_0\times...\times Q_n} \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)) \neq \emptyset,$$

   where $\overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n))$ is the closed convex hull of $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)$ (i.e., the closure of the simplex spanned by $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$).

Based on the above, we shall prove the following:

Theorem 9.7. *Let X be a weighted, $(n+1)$-partite, pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with a weight function m. Denote the sides of X by $S_0, ..., S_n$. Assume that there is a constant $0 \leq \mathcal{E}_n$ such that for every non empty sets $U_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., U_n \subseteq S_n$ the following holds:*

$$\left| \frac{m(U_0, ..., U_n)}{m(X^{(0)})} - \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \frac{m(U_0)...m(U_n)}{m(S_0)...m(S_n)} \right| \leq \mathcal{E}_n \left(\frac{m(U_0)...m(U_n)}{m(S_0)...m(S_n)} \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}.$$

Assume further that

$$\mathcal{E}_n < \frac{c(n)^n}{n!}$$

Then X has weighted ε-geometric overlap with

$$\varepsilon = \min \left\{ \frac{\omega(n)}{(n+1)^2}, c(n) \left(c(n)^n - (n+1)! \, \mathcal{E}_n \right) \right\}.$$

Proof. Fix $\phi : X^{(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that by definition we have for every i that

$$m(S_i) = \frac{m(X^{(0)})}{n+1}.$$

If there is $u \in X^{(0)}$ such that

$$m(u) \geq \omega(n) m(S_i) = \omega(n) \frac{m(X^{(0)})}{n+1}.$$

Then for $O = \phi(u)$ we have that (using proposition 3.5)

$$\begin{aligned} m(\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : O \in \widetilde{\phi}(\sigma)\}) &\geq m(\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : u \in \sigma\}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} m(u) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n!} \omega(n) \frac{1}{n+1} m(X^{(0)}). \end{aligned}$$

Using proposition 3.5 again to deduce

$$m(X^{(0)}) = (n+1)! \, m(X^{(n)}),$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned} m(\{\sigma \in X^{(n)} : O \in \widetilde{\phi}(\sigma)\}) &\geq \omega(n) \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} m(X^{(n)}) \\ &\geq \varepsilon m(X^{(n)}). \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that for every $u \in X^{(0)}$, we have that

$$m(u) < \omega(n) \frac{1}{n+1} m(X^{(0)}) = \omega(n) \min\{m(S_0), ..., m(S_n)\}.$$

By theorem A.1 stated above we have that there pairwise disjoints sets $Q_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq S_n$ such that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$,

$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n) m(S_i),$$

and

$$\bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n)\in Q_0\times...\times Q_n} \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0),...,\phi(u_n)) \neq \emptyset.$$

By our assumption on mixing, we also have

$$\left|\frac{m(Q_0,...,Q_n)}{m(X^{(0)})} - \frac{1}{(n+1)!}\frac{m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)}{m(S_0)...m(S_n)}\right| \leq \mathcal{E}_n \left(\frac{m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)}{m(S_0)...m(S_n)}\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}.$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&m(Q_0,...,Q_n)\\
&\geq m(X^{(0)})\left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\frac{m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)}{m(S_0)...m(S_n)} - \mathcal{E}_n\left(\frac{m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)}{m(S_0)...m(S_n)}\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}\right)\\
&= m(X^{(0)})\left(\frac{m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)}{m(S_0)...m(S_n)}\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}\left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\left(\frac{m(Q_0)...m(Q_n)}{m(S_0)...m(S_n)}\right)^{\frac{n}{n+1}} - \mathcal{E}_n\right)\\
&\geq m(X^{(0)})c(n)\left(\frac{c(n)^n}{(n+1)!} - \mathcal{E}_n\right)\\
&= m(X^{(n)})(n+1)!\,c(n)\left(\frac{c(n)^n}{(n+1)!} - \mathcal{E}_n\right)\\
&= m(X^{(n)})c(n)\left(c(n)^n - (n+1)!\,\mathcal{E}_n\right)\\
&\geq \varepsilon m(X^{(n)}).
\end{aligned}$$

(Again, we used the fact that $m(X^{(0)}) = (n+1)!\,m(X^{(n)})$)

□

Now we are ready to give the exact statement and the proof of theorem 2.12 stated above:

Corollary 9.8. *Let X be a pure n-dimensional, weighted, $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex such that all the links of X of dimension > 0 are connected. There is a continuous function $\varepsilon(\lambda) : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that:*

- *We have that*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 1}\varepsilon(\lambda) = \min\left\{\frac{\omega(n)}{(n+1)^2}, c(n)^{n+1}\right\} > 0,$$

  when $\omega(n), c(n)$ are the constants as in the above theorem.

- *For a given λ if $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$, $\varepsilon(\lambda) > 0$, and*

$$\bigcup_{\tau\in\Sigma(n-2)} Spec(\Delta^+_{\tau,0}) \setminus \{0\} \subseteq [\lambda,\infty),$$

  then X has $\varepsilon(\lambda)$-geometric overlap.

Proof. Combine the above theorem with corollary 8.13. □

10 Examples

10.1 Groups acting on simplicial complexes

Let Γ be a discrete group acting simplicially and cocompactly on a connected infinite simplicial complex $\widetilde{X}$. Denote by d the distance on $\widetilde{X}$. Assume that

$$\min\{d(v, g.v) : g \in \Gamma \setminus \{e\}, v \in \widetilde{X}^{(0)}\} \geq 3.$$

This assumption implies that every link in $X = \widetilde{X}/\Gamma$ which is not the trivial link, $X_\emptyset = X$, is isomorphic to a link in $\widetilde{X}$. This leads to the following observation: under the above assumptions, if $\widetilde{X}$ above is pure n-dimensional such that all the links of $\widetilde{X}$ are connected (apart from the 0-dimensional links) and such that there is $\lambda > \frac{n-1}{n}$ such that

$$\inf_{\tau \in \widetilde{X}^{(n-2)}} \lambda(\widetilde{X}_\tau) \geq \lambda,$$

then $X = \widetilde{X}/\Gamma$ has λ-local spectral expansion. If in addition there is $\kappa < 2$ such that

$$\sup_{\tau \in \widetilde{X}^{(n-2)}} \kappa(\widetilde{X}_\tau) \leq \kappa,$$

then $X = \widetilde{X}/\Gamma$ has two sided (λ, κ)-local spectral expansion.
Examples of this sort appear in the explicit construction of Ramanujan complexes in [LSV05]. Specifically, it is shown there that given any prime q and any $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ($r > 1$ if $q = 2$), there is an affine building $\widetilde{X}$ of type $\widetilde{A}_n$ and thickness $q^r + 1$ and a sequence of Γ_i acting simplicially and cocompactly on $\widetilde{X}$ such that the quotients $X_i = \widetilde{X}/\Gamma_i$ are arbitrarily large, i.e.,

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \left| \left(\widetilde{X}/\Gamma_i \right)^{(0)} \right| = \infty,$$

and such that for every i,

$$\min\{d(v, g.v) : g \in \Gamma_i \setminus \{e\}, v \in \widetilde{X}^{(0)}\} \geq 3.$$

We will not review the theory of Tits buildings here, but only recall that an affine building of type $\widetilde{A}_n$ is a connected, pure n-dimensional simplicial complex with connected links (apart from the 0-dimensional links) such that for every $\tau \in \widetilde{X}^{(n-2)}$ we have one of the following options:

1. $\widetilde{X}_\tau$ is a complete bipartite graph. In this case
$$\lambda(\widetilde{X}_\tau) = 1, \kappa(\widetilde{X}_\tau) = 2.$$
2. $\widetilde{X}_\tau$ is a spherical building of type A_2 and thickness $q^r + 1$. In this case (see [FH64]),
$$\lambda(\widetilde{X}_\tau) = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{q^r}}{q^r + 1}, \kappa(\widetilde{X}_\tau) = 2.$$

It is clear that if q, r are large enough with respect to n (for instance, if $q^r > n^2$), then for every $\tau \in \widetilde{X}^{(n-2)}$ we have

$$\lambda(\widetilde{X}_\tau) \geq 1 - \frac{\sqrt{q^r}}{q^r+1} > \frac{n-1}{n}$$

and $X_i = \widetilde{X}/\Gamma_i$ will have $(1 - \frac{\sqrt{q^r}}{q^r+1})$-local spectral expansion for every i. In this example, achieving mixing in the general case is hopeless because the 1-dimensional links are bipartite graphs (therefore one should not expect two-sided local spectral expansion). However, Choosing the right Γ_i's, one can make sure that $\widetilde{X}/\Gamma_i$ is a $(n+1)$-partite simplicial complex and therefore has the mixing result for the $(n+1)$-partite case. From this using corollary 9.8, one can construct an infinite family of simplicial complexes with the same ε-geometric overlap (given the q is chosen to be large enough). A similar construction was given in [FGL$^+$12] but the arguments used there to show mixing (and therefore geometric overlap) where completely different.
More generally, groups acting on simplicial Tits-building under the conditions mentioned above are likely to provide examples of simplicial complexes with local spectral expansion, provided that the thickness of the building is large enough (we recall that the spectral gaps of all 1-dimensional links that appear in a simplicial Tits-building where calculated explicitly in [FH64]). Also, if can take quotients such that the simplicial complexes are $(n+1)$-partite, then one can get mixing and geometric overlap for large enough thickness. The fact that quotients of any affine building yields a simplicial complexes with geometric overlap was conjectured in [Lub13], but as far as we know, we are the first to prove it.

10.2 Random complexes

First let us describe the model $X(N,p)$ for random complexes. $X \sim X(N,p)$ is randomly chosen in the following way:

1. X has N vertices $\{v_1, ..., v_N\}$.
2. For every two vertices v_i, v_j, there is an edge between v_i, v_j with probability p.
3. After all the edges are randomly chosen, X is completed to be a flag complex, i.e., for every set $\{v_{i_1}, ..., v_{i_k}\}$ we have:

$$\{v_{i_1}, ..., v_{i_k}\} \in X^{(k-1)} \Leftrightarrow \forall 1 \leq j < l \leq k, \{v_{i_j}, v_{i_l}\} \in X^{(1)}.$$

In random complex theory, one is usually interested in asymptotic properties when $N \to \infty$. We shall say that $X \sim X(N,p)$ has some property $\mathcal{P}$ with high probability if

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(X \text{ has property } \mathcal{P}) = 1.$$

In [Kah14] it is shown that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $X \sim X(N,p)$ such that there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$p \geq \left(\frac{\left(\frac{n}{2} + 1 + \varepsilon\right) \log N}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}},$$

then (the n-skeleton of) X has the following properties with high probability:

1. X is pure n-dimensional ([Kah14][Lemma 3.1]).
2. X is connected (this is simply due to *Erdős-Rényi theorem*).
3. All the $1, ..., (n-1)$-dimensional links of are connected ([Kah14][Proof of part (1) of Theorem 1.1]).
4. For every $\alpha > 0$ and every $\sigma \in X^{(n-2)}$, $\lambda(X_\sigma) \geq 1-\alpha$ and $\kappa(X_\sigma) \leq 1+\alpha$. ([Kah14][Proof of part (1) of Theorem 1.1] only proves this result only for $\lambda(X_\sigma)$, but using [HKP13][Theorem 1.1], the result for $\kappa(X_\sigma)$ also follows).

Therefore, we get that for suitable $p(N,n)$, $X \sim X(N,p)$ is with high probability (the n-skeleton of) X is pure n-dimensional simplicial complex that has for every $\alpha > 0$ a two-sided $(1-\alpha, 1+\alpha)$-local spectral expansion. Therefore, if α is small enough, by corollary 9.6 these complexes will have $\varepsilon(1-\alpha, 1+\alpha)$-geometric overlap, where $\varepsilon(1-\alpha, 1+\alpha) > 0$.

A A weighted version of a result by Pach

The aim of this appendix is to prove the following version of a theorem by Pach proven in [Pac98] (all the ideas of this proof appear in [Pac98], the aim of the appendix is just to adapt the ideas to the weighted setting).

Theorem A.1. *Let V be a finite set and $m : V \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be some fixed map. For $U \subseteq V$, denote*

$$m(U) = \sum_{u \in U} m(u).$$

Then for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are constants $0 < \omega(n) \leq 1, c(n) > 0$ such that for every $\phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and every disjoint partition of V, $S_0, ..., S_n$, one of the following holds:

1. *There is a vertex $u \in V$ such that*

$$m(u) \geq \omega(n) \min\{m(S_0), ..., m(S_n)\}.$$

2. *There are sets $Q_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq S_n$ such that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n) m(S_i),$$

and

$$\bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n) \in Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n} \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)) \neq \emptyset,$$

where $\overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n))$ is the closed convex hull of $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)$ (i.e., the closure of the simplex spanned by $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$).

To prove the theorem we shall need a few preliminary results.

Lemma A.2. *Let V be a finite set, $S_0, ..., S_n$ be a disjoint partition of V and $m : V \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be some fixed map. For a set $A \subseteq S_0 \times ... \times S_n$, denote*

$$e(A) = \sum_{(u_0,...,u_n)\in A} m(u_0)m(u_1)...m(u_n).$$

Assume there is $\beta > 0$ and a set $A \subseteq S_0 \times ... \times S_n$ such that

$$e(A) \geq \beta m(S_0)...m(S_n).$$

Let $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2 < 1$, such that

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_2}(1-\varepsilon_2^{n+1}) < 1.$$

Then there are non empty subsets $T_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., T_n \subseteq S_n$ and a constant $\alpha = \alpha(n, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, such that the following holds:

1. *For any $0 \leq i \leq n$, we have that*

$$m(T_i) \geq \beta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} m(S_i).$$

2. $$e(A \cap (T_0 \times ... \times T_n)) \geq \beta m(T_0)...m(T_n).$$

3. *For every subsets $Q_0 \subseteq T_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq T_n$ with $\varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{m(Q_i)}{m(T_i)} \leq \varepsilon_2$ for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, we have that $e(A \cap (Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n)) > 0$.*

Proof. Fix $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2 < 1$, such that

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_2}(1-\varepsilon_2^{n+1}) < 1.$$

Define

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (1-\varepsilon_1)^{1-x} \varepsilon_2^{i(1-x)} = (1-\varepsilon_1)^{1-x} \frac{1-\varepsilon_2^{n+1-(n+1)x}}{1-\varepsilon_2^{1-x}}.$$

It is easy to see that $g(x)$ is continuous on the interval $[0, 1)$ and that

$$g(0) = \frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_2}(1-\varepsilon_2^{n+1}) < 1.$$

Choose some $\alpha > 0$ such that $g(\alpha) < 1$ (as noted above the value of such α depends on $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ and n). Next, choose $T_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., T_n \subseteq S_n$ such that

$$\frac{e(A \cap (T_0 \times ... \times T_n))}{(m(T_0)...m(T_n))^{1-\alpha}}$$

is maximal. By maximality we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{e(A \cap (T_0 \times ... \times T_n))}{(m(T_0)...m(T_n))^{1-\alpha}} &\geq \frac{e(A)}{(m(S_0)...m(S_n))^{1-\alpha}} \\
&= \frac{e(A)}{(m(S_0)...m(S_n))} (m(S_0)...m(S_n))^{\alpha} \\
&\geq \beta (m(S_0)...m(S_n))^{\alpha} \\
&\geq \beta (m(T_0)...m(T_n))^{\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$e(A \cap (T_0 \times ... \times T_n)) \geq \beta m(T_0)...m(T_n).$$

From the same computation, combined with the inequality

$$(m(T_0)...m(T_n))^{\alpha} \geq \frac{e(A \cap (T_0 \times ... \times T_n))}{(m(T_0)...m(T_n))^{1-\alpha}},$$

we get that

$$(m(T_0)...m(T_n))^{\alpha} \geq \beta \left(m(S_0)...m(S_n)\right)^{\alpha}.$$

Therefore,

$$m(T_0)...m(T_n) \geq \beta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} m(S_0)...m(S_n).$$

Which yields for every i:

$$m(T_i) \geq \beta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} m(S_i) \frac{m(S_0)}{m(T_0)} ... \frac{m(S_{i-1})}{m(T_{i-1})} \frac{m(S_{i+1})}{m(T_{i+1})} ... \frac{m(S_n)}{m(T_n)} \geq \beta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} m(S_i).$$

Next, let $Q_0 \subseteq T_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq T_n$ with $\varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{m(Q_i)}{m(T_i)} \leq \varepsilon_2$ for every $0 \leq i \leq n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} e(A \cap (Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n)) = e(A \cap (T_0 \times ... \times T_n)) &- e(A \cap ((T_0 \setminus Q_0) \times T_1 \times ... \times T_n)) \\ &- e(A \cap (Q_0 \times (T_1 \setminus Q_1) \times T_2 \times ... \times T_n)) - ... \\ &- e(A \cap (Q_0 \times Q_1 \times ... \times Q_{l-1} \times (T_n \setminus Q_n))). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{e(A \cap ((T_0 \setminus Q_0) \times T_1 \times ... \times T_n))}{(m((T_0 \setminus Q_0))m(T_1)...m(T_n))^{1-\alpha}} \leq \frac{e(A \cap (T_0 \times T_1 \times ... \times T_n))}{(m((T_0)m(T_1)...m(T_n))^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} e(A \cap ((T_0 \setminus Q_0) \times T_1 \times ... \times T_n) \leq \left(\frac{m((T_0 \setminus Q_0))}{m(T_0)}\right)^{1-\alpha} e(A \\ \cap (T_0 \times T_1 \times ... \times T_n)) \leq (1-\varepsilon_1)^{1-\alpha} e(A \cap (T_0 \times T_1 \times ... \times T_n)). \end{aligned}$$

In the same manner, for every $0 \leq i \leq n$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} e(A \cap (Q_0 \times Q_1 \times ... \times Q_{i-1} \times (T_i \setminus Q_i) \times T_{i+1} \times ... \times T_n) \leq \\ (1-\varepsilon_1)^{1-\alpha} \varepsilon_2^{i(1-\alpha)} e(A \cap (T_0 \times T_1 \times ... \times T_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} e(A \cap (Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n)) &\geq e(A \cap (T_0 \times ... \times T_n)) \left(1 - \sum_{i=0}^{n} (1-\varepsilon_1)^{1-\alpha} \varepsilon_2^{i(1-\alpha)}\right) \\ &= e(A \cap (T_0 \times ... \times T_n))(1 - g(\alpha)) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark A.3. *The condition*

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_2}(1-\varepsilon_2^{n+1})<1$$

obviously holds when $\varepsilon_1=\varepsilon_2$. Therefore for every $0<\varepsilon_1$, if one takes ε_2 such that $\varepsilon_2-\varepsilon_1$ is small enough, then the condition above holds. Explicitly, one can always take $\varepsilon_2=\varepsilon_1+(1-\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_1^{n+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_2}(1-\varepsilon_2^{n+1}) &= \frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_1-(1-\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_1^{n+1}}(1-(\varepsilon_1+(1-\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_1^{n+1})^{n+1})\\ &< \frac{1-\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_1-(1-\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_1^{n+1}}(1-\varepsilon_1^{n+1})\\ &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

Another result we'll need is a Boros-Füredi type theorem for the weighted case taken from Karasev [Kar12]:

Theorem A.4. *Let $\mu_0,...,\mu_n$ be discrete probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$. A random n-simplex is a simplex spanned by $x_0,...,x_n\in\mathbb{R}^n$ where for every i, x_i is distributed according to the measure μ_i. Then for any choice of $\mu_0,...,\mu_n$ there is a point $O\in\mathbb{R}^n$ such that the probability of a random n-simplex to contain O is $\geq\frac{1}{(n+1)!}$.*

Remark A.5. *The result stated in [Kar12][Theorem 1] is for absolutely continuous probability measures, but in the remark after [Kar12][Theorem 2] it is explained how to pass from continuous probability measures to discrete measures.*

Next, recall that a $(n+1)$-tuple of convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called separated any j of them can be strictly separated from the other $n+1-j$ by a hyperplane. A family of convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called separated, if any $(n+1)$-tuple of the family is separated. The following theorem taken from [GPW96] gives a nice characterization of separated families:

Theorem A.6. *A family of convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is separated if and only if no $n+1$ of its members can be intersected by a hyperplane.*

Corollary A.7. *Let $C_0,...,C_n,\{O\}$ be a separated family of convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($O\in\mathbb{R}^l$ is a single point). If there are $p_0\in C_0,...,p_n\in C_n$ such that $O\in conv(p_0,...,p_l)$, then for every $q_0\in C_0,...,q_n\in C_n$, we have that $O\in conv(q_0,...,q_n)$.*

Proof. Assume towards contradiction that there are points $q_0\in C_0,...,q_n\in C_n$, such that $O\notin conv(q_0,...,q_n)$. For $0\leq\gamma\leq 1$ and $0\leq i\leq n$, denote $\gamma p_i+(1-\gamma)q_i\in C_i$ the corresponding point on the interval connecting p_i and q_i. From continuity we get that there is some γ' such that O is in on an $n-1$ face of the simplex spanned by $\gamma' p_0,...,\gamma' p_n$, but this is in contradiction (by the above theorem) to the fact the $C_0,...,C_n,\{O\}$ is a separated family. □

Last, we'll need the following separation with respect to weight result:

Lemma A.8. *Let V a finite set, $m:V\to\mathbb{R}^+$, $S_0,...,S_n$ a disjoint partition of V, $T_0\subseteq S_0,...,T_n\subseteq S_n$ non empty sets and $\phi:V\to\mathbb{R}^n$ be a map that sends V*

to points in general position in $\mathbb{R}^n$.
Assume that for every $u \in V$, *we have that*

$$m(u) \leq \frac{\min\{\frac{m(T_0)}{m(S_0)}, ..., \frac{m(T_n)}{m(S_n)}\}}{2^{2+n2^n}} \frac{1}{n} \min\{m(S_0), ..., m(S_n)\}.$$

Then for every point $O \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (\phi(T_0) \cup ... \cup \phi(T_n))$, *there are non empty sets* $Q_0 \subseteq T_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq T_n$ *such that*

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq n, m(Q_i) \geq \frac{1}{1 + 2^{n2^n}} m(T_i),$$

and $\overline{conv}(\phi(Q_0)), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(Q_n)), \{O\}$ *is a separated family in* $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. Denote

$$\Omega = \frac{\min\{\frac{m(T_0)}{m(S_0)}, ..., \frac{m(T_n)}{m(S_n)}\}}{2^{2+n2^n}}.$$

For every hyperplane H in $\mathbb{R}^n$ denote by H^+, H^- the two open half spaces "above" and "below" H. We'll start by choosing $T_0' \subseteq T_0, ..., T_n' \subseteq T_n$ such that $\overline{conv}(\phi(T_0')), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(T_n'))$ is a separated $(n+1)$-tuple in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $m(T_0'), ..., m(T_n')$ that are not "too small". This is done using the discrete ham sandwich theorem (see for instance [Hil88]). Start with $T_0, ..., T_n$, if $\overline{conv}(\phi(T_0)), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(T_n))$ is a separated $n+1$ tuple, we are done.
Otherwise, say that $\overline{conv}(\phi(T_0)), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(T_j))$ are not separated by a hyperplane from $\overline{conv}(\phi(T_{j+1})), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(T_n))$. By the ham sandwich theorem there is a hyperplane H such that for every $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, we have

$$m(T_i \cap \phi^{-1}(H^+ \cup H)) \geq \frac{1}{2} m(T_i) \text{ and } m(T_i \cap \phi^{-1}(H^- \cup H)) \geq \frac{1}{2} m(T_i).$$

Note that by the assumption that $\phi(V)$ is in general position in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have that for every i, there are at most n vertices $v_1, ..., v_n \in T_i$ such that

$$\phi(v_1), ..., \phi(v_n) \in H.$$

Therefore we have for every i that

$$m(T_i \cap \phi^{-1}(H)) \leq n \frac{\Omega}{n} m(S_i) = \Omega m(S_i).$$

Therefore

$$m(T_i \cap \phi^{-1}(H^+)) \geq \frac{1}{2} m(T_i) - \Omega m(S_i) \text{ and } m(T_i \cap \phi^{-1}(H^-)) \geq \frac{1}{2} m(T_i) - \Omega m(S_i).$$

Without loss of generality, we also have

$$m(T_n \cap \phi^{-1}(H^+)) \geq \frac{1}{2} m(T_n) - \Omega m(S_n).$$

Then define new sets

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq j, T_i^{(1)} = T_i \cap \phi^{-1}(H^-),$$

$$\forall j+1 \leq i \leq n, T_i^{(1)} = T_i \cap \phi^{-1}(H^+).$$

If $\overline{conv}(\phi(T_0^{(1)})), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(T_n^{(1)}))$ is a separated $(n+1)$-tuple, we are done. Otherwise repeat the above process. Notice that after at most 2^n steps, we get a separated $(n+1)$-tuple $\overline{conv}(\phi(T_0')), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(T_l'))$ with

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq n, m(T_i') \geq \frac{1}{2^{2^n}} m(T_i) - \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \frac{1}{2^k} \Omega m(S_i).$$

In the same manner, we can have, for example, $T_0'' \subseteq T_0', ..., T_{n-1}'' \subseteq T_{n-1}', T_n'' = T_n'$ such that $\{O\}, \overline{conv}(\phi(T_0'')), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(T_{n-1}''))$ is a separated $(n+1)$-tuple (the only difference is that when applying the above process, we always keep the point O even in the cases where H passes through it). After that, we'll apply the same process to get $T_0''' \subseteq T_0'', ..., T_{n-1}''' = T_{n-1}'', T_n''' \subseteq T_n''$ such that $\{O\}, \overline{conv}(\phi(T_0'')), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(T_{n-2}'')), \overline{conv}(\phi(T_n''))$ is a separated $(n+1)$-tuple and so on. Therefore, at the end we'll have sets $Q_0 \subseteq T_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq T_n$ such that $\overline{conv}(\phi(Q_0)), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(Q_n)), \{O\}$ is a separated family and for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} m(Q_i) &\geq \frac{1}{2^{n2^n}} m(T_i) - \sum_{k=0}^{n2^n-1} \frac{1}{2^k} \Omega m(S_i) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^{n2^n}} m(T_i) - 2\Omega m(S_i) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^{n2^n}} m(T_i) - 2\frac{1}{2^{2+n2^n}} \frac{m(T_i)}{m(S_i)} m(S_i) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^{1+n2^n}} m(T_i). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are finally ready to prove theorem A.1:

Proof. Let V and $m : V \to \mathbb{R}^+$ as in the theorem. Denote $\varepsilon_1 = \frac{1}{2^{1+n2^n}}$ and take ε_2 such that $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1$ and such that the condition in lemma A.2 holds (this can be done for instance, by choosing ε_2 as in the remark after lemma A.2). Denote $\alpha = \alpha(n, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ as the constant from lemma A.2. Choose

$$\omega(n) = \min\left\{\frac{1}{n2^{2+n2^n}}, \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1\right\}\left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

Fix a disjoint partition $S_0, ..., S_l$. We'll split the proof into two cases:
Case 1 (assuming general position):
Assume that $\phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that V to points in general position in $\mathbb{R}^n$.
We'll use theorem A.4. For every $0 \leq i \leq n$ define a measure

$$\mu_i = \sum_{u \in S_i} \frac{m(u)}{m(S_i)} \delta_u,$$

where δ_u is the delta measure at u. By theorem A.4, there is a point $O \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that for the set

$$A = \{(u_0, ..., u_n) \in S_0 \times ... \times S_n : O \in \overline{conv}(u_0, ..., u_n)\},$$

we have the following inequality:

$$\sum_{(u_0,...,u_l)\in A} \mu_0(u_0)...\mu_n(u_n) \geq \frac{1}{(n+1)!}.$$

Note that this inequality can be rewritten (in the notation of lemma A.2) as:

$$e(A) \geq \frac{1}{(n+1)!} m(S_0)...m(S_n).$$

Note that for all i, we have that $O \notin \phi(S_i)$. Indeed, if, for example, $O \in \phi(S_0)$, then we denote $s_0 = \phi^{-1}(\{O\}) \in S_0$ (this is a single vertex, from the general position assumption) and without loss of generality, we can assume $A = \{s_0\} \times S_1 \times ... \times S_n$. Therefore,

$$e(A) = m(s_0)m(S_1)...m(S_n) \geq \frac{1}{(n+1)!} m(S_0)m(S_1)...m(S_n).$$

This yields that

$$m(s_0) \geq \frac{m(S_0)}{(n+1)!} > \omega(n) \min\{m(S_0), ..., m(S_n)\}.$$

in contradiction to the choice of $\omega(n)$.
By lemma A.2 with $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \alpha$ as above, there are sets $T_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., T_n \subseteq S_n$ with

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq n, m(T_i) \geq \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} m(S_i).$$

Note that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, we have that

$$\frac{m(T_i)}{m(S_i)} \frac{1}{n2^{2+n2^n}} \geq \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{n2^{2+n2^n}} \geq \omega(n).$$

Therefore, we can apply lemma A.8 and get $Q_0 \subseteq T_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq T_n$ such that $\overline{conv}(\phi(Q_0)), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(Q_n)), \{O\}$ is a separated family in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq n, \frac{1}{2^{1+n2^n}} = \varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{m(Q_i)}{m(T_i)}.$$

Note that from the definition of $\omega(n)$ we have that for every $u \in S_i$ that

$$\frac{m(u)}{m(S_i)} \leq \omega(n),$$

and therefore for every i and for every $u \in T_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{m(u)}{m(T_i)} &= \frac{m(u)}{m(S_i)} \frac{m(S_i)}{m(T_i)} \\
&\leq \omega(n) \frac{m(S_i)}{m(T_i)} \\
&\leq \omega(n) \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \\
&\leq \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by deleting elements from the Q_i's, if necessary, we can make sure that

$$\forall 0 \leq i \leq n, \varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{m(Q_i)}{m(T_i)} \leq \varepsilon_2.$$

By lemma A.2, we have that

$$e(A \cap (Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n)) > 0.$$

This implies there is $(q_0, ..., q_n) \in Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n$ such that $O \in conv(\phi(q_0), ..., \phi(q_l))$. By our choice of $Q_0, ..., Q_n$, $\overline{conv}(\phi(Q_0)), ..., \overline{conv}(\phi(Q_n)), \{O\}$ is a separated family, and therefore by corollary A.7, we have that

$$O \in \bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n) \in Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n} conv(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)).$$

Notice that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$,

$$m(Q_i) \geq \varepsilon_1 m(T_i) \geq \varepsilon_1 \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} m(S_i) = \frac{1}{2^{1+n2^n}} \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} m(S_i),$$

therefore we can take

$$c(n) = \frac{1}{2^{1+n2^n}} \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

Case 2:
Assume now that $\phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is arbitrary ($\phi(V)$ is not necessarily in general position in $\mathbb{R}^n$). By taking arbitrarily small perturbations of ϕ we generate a sequence $\phi_j : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that for each j, $\phi_j(V)$ is in general position in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and such that

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \sup_{u \in V} |\phi(u) - \phi_j(u)| = 0.$$

From case 1, we have that for every such ϕ_j, there are sets $Q_0^j \subseteq S_0, ..., Q_n^j \subseteq S_n$ and a point $O_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that

$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n) m(S_i),$$

and

$$O_j \in \bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n) \in Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n} \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)).$$

After passing to a subsequence, we can assume that there are sets $Q_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq S_n$ such that for every j,

$$Q_0 = Q_0^j, ..., Q_n = Q_n^j.$$

Also, up to passing to a subsequence, we can assume that the sequence O_j is convergent in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and denote

$$O = \lim_{j \to \infty} O_j.$$

Therefore we get that

$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n) m(S_i).$$

Also, for every $(u_0, ..., u_n) \in Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n$ we have that

$$O_j \in \overline{conv}(\phi_j(u_0), ..., \phi_j(u_n)),$$

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \phi_j(u_0) = \phi(u_0), ..., \lim_{j\to\infty} \phi_j(u_n) = \phi(u_n), \lim_{j\to\infty} O_j = O.$$

This implies that for every $(u_0, ..., u_n) \in Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n$,

$$O \in \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)),$$

and we are done. □

Corollary A.9. *Let V be a finite set and $m : V \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be some fixed map. Then for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that for every $\phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$, one of the following holds:*

1. *There is $u \in V$ such that*

$$m(u) \geq \omega(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(V),$$

where $\omega(n)$ is the constant in theorem A.1.

2. *There are pairwise disjoint sets $Q_0, ..., Q_n \subset V$ such that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n)\frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(V),$$

where $c(n)$ is the constant in theorem A.1, and

$$\bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n)\in Q_0\times...\times Q_n} \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)) \neq \emptyset,$$

where $\overline{conv}(u_0, ..., u_n)$ is the closure of the convex hull of $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)$ (i.e., the closed simplex spanned by $\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$).

Proof. Fix $\phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$. By the choice of $\omega(n)$ in the proof of theorem A.1, it is clear that $\omega(n) < 1$. Therefore, we can assume that for every $u \in V$,

$$m(u) < \frac{1}{2(n+1)}m(V).$$

Consider now the following partitioning algorithm: order the elements of V as $u_1, ..., u_{|V|}$ such that for all j, $m(u_j) \geq m(u_{j+1})$. Partition accolading to the following algorithm:

1. $S_0^0 = \emptyset, ..., S_n^0 = \emptyset$.
2. For $1 \leq j \leq |V|$, choose S_i^{j-1} such that

$$m(S_i^{j-1}) = \min\{m(S_0^{j-1}), ..., m(S_n^{j-1})\},$$

(for this algorithm, if S_i^{j-1} is empty, then $m(S_i^{j-1}) = 0$). Set

$$S_0^j = S_0^{j-1}, ..., S_{i-1}^j = S_{i-1}^{j-1}, S_{i+1}^j = S_{i+1}^{j-1}, ..., S_n^j = S_n^{j-1},$$

and

$$S_i^j = S_i^{j-1} \cup \{u_i\}.$$

3. Denote $S_0 = S_0^{|V|}, ..., S_n = S_n^{|V|}$.

Following this algorithm, it is easy to see that for all i, $m(S_i) > \frac{1}{2(n+1)} m(V)$. Therefore for every $u \in V$, we have that

$$m(u) < \omega(n) \frac{1}{2(n+1)} m(V) < \omega(n) \min\{m(S_0), ..., m(S_n)\}.$$

By theorem A.1 there are sets $Q_0 \subseteq S_0, ..., Q_n \subseteq S_n$ such that for every $0 \leq i \leq n$,

$$m(Q_i) \geq c(n) m(S_i) \geq c(n) \frac{1}{2(n+1)} m(V),$$

and

$$\bigcap_{(u_0,...,u_n) \in Q_0 \times ... \times Q_n} \overline{conv}(\phi(u_0), ..., \phi(u_n)) \neq \emptyset.$$

□

Remark A.10. *The reader should note that throughout this appendix, we did not optimize our arguments to get the best constants.*

References

[BŚ97] W. Ballmann and J. Świątkowski. On L^2-cohomology and property (T) for automorphism groups of polyhedral cell complexes. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(4):615–645, 1997.

[Chu96] F. R. K. Chung. Laplacians of graphs and Cheeger's inequalities. In *Combinatorics, Paul Erdős is eighty, Vol. 2 (Keszthely, 1993)*, volume 2 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 157–172. János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 1996.

[DJ02] Jan Dymara and Tadeusz Januszkiewicz. Cohomology of buildings and their automorphism groups. *Invent. Math.*, 150(3):579–627, 2002.

[EGL14] Shai Evra, Konstantin Golubev, and Alexander Lubotzky. Mixing properties and the chromatic number of ramanujan complexes. `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1407.7700.pdf`, 2014.

[FGL+12] Jacob Fox, Mikhail Gromov, Vincent Lafforgue, Assaf Naor, and János Pach. Overlap properties of geometric expanders. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 671:49–83, 2012.

[FH64] Walter Feit and Graham Higman. The nonexistence of certain generalized polygons. *J. Algebra*, 1:114–131, 1964.

[Gar73] Howard Garland. p-adic curvature and the cohomology of discrete subgroups of p-adic groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 97:375–423, 1973.

[GPW96] Jacob E. Goodman, Richard Pollack, and Rephael Wenger. Bounding the number of geometric permutations induced by k-transversals. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 75(2):187–197, 1996.

[Gro10] Mikhail Gromov. Singularities, expanders and topology of maps. Part 2: From combinatorics to topology via algebraic isoperimetry. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 20(2):416–526, 2010.

[GS14] Anna Gundert and May Szedlák. Higher dimensional discrete cheeger inequalities. `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1401.2290v1.pdf`, 2014.

[Hil88] Theodore P. Hill. Common hyperplane medians for random vectors. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 95(5):437–441, 1988.

[HKP13] Christopher Hoffman, Matthew Kahle, and Elliot Paquette. Spectral gaps of random graphs and applications to random topology. `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1201.0425v3.pdf`, 2013.

[Kah14] Matthew Kahle. Sharp vanishing thresholds for cohomology of random flag complexes. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 179(3):1085–1107, 2014.

[Kar12] Roman Karasev. A simpler proof of the Boros-Füredi-Bárány-Pach-Gromov theorem. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 47(3):492–495, 2012.

[Kas11] Martin Kassabov. Subspace arrangements and property T. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 5(2):445–477, 2011.

[LM06] Nathan Linial and Roy Meshulam. Homological connectivity of random 2-complexes. *Combinatorica*, 26(4):475–487, 2006.

[LSV05] Alexander Lubotzky, Beth Samuels, and Uzi Vishne. Explicit constructions of Ramanujan complexes of type $\widetilde{A}_d$. *European J. Combin.*, 26(6):965–993, 2005.

[Lub12] Alexander Lubotzky. Expander graphs in pure and applied mathematics. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 49(1):113–162, 2012.

[Lub13] Alexander Lubotzky. Ramanujan complexes and high dimensional expanders. `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1301.1028v2.pdf`, 2013.

[MW09] R. Meshulam and N. Wallach. Homological connectivity of random k-dimensional complexes. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 34(3):408–417, 2009.

[Opp12] Izhar Oppenheim. Vanishing of cohomology and property (t) for groups acting on weighted simplicial complexes. `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1110.5724.pdf`, 2012. to appear in "Group, Geometry and Dynamics".

[Pac98] János Pach. A Tverberg-type result on multicolored simplices. *Comput. Geom.*, 10(2):71–76, 1998.

[Par13] Ori Parzanchevski. Mixing in high-dimensional expanders. `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1310.6477.pdf`, 2013.

[PRT12] Ori Parzanchevski, Ron Rosenthal, and Ran J. Tessler. Isoperimetric inequalities in simplicial complexes. `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1207.0638.pdf`, 2012.

[Żuk96] Andrzej Żuk. La propriété (T) de Kazhdan pour les groupes agissant sur les polyèdres. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 323(5):453–458, 1996.

IZHAR OPPENHEIM, Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA

E-mail address: izharo@gmail.com